

BW404

W4II5

John Scott

on

John Harrison

1050

109

BW404

W415

**Wesley Memorial Library**

**Thursfield Smith Collection  
of  
Wesleyana**



**Atlanta, - Georgia**

Wes. 1525

# WESLEYAN DISCIPLINE.

---

## A STATEMENT

OF

THE CASE OF MR. JOHN HARRISON,

AS PRESENTED TO THE

ISLINGTON LEADERS'-MEETING,

JANUARY 22<sup>D</sup> :

WITH THEIR DECISION,

JANUARY 24<sup>TH</sup> ;

AND

THAT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT MINISTER,

THE REV. JOHN SCOTT,

FEBRUARY 5<sup>TH</sup>, 1850.

LONDON :

PUBLISHED BY JOHN MASON, 14, CITY-ROAD ;

SOLD AT 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

---

MDCCCL.

BW404  
.W415

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY JAMES NICHOLS,  
HOXTON-SQUARE.

Wes. 1525

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

It is with great reluctance that I give publicity to such part of the following statement as relates to Mr. Harrison. The Leaders'-Meeting, by a vote, requested me to publish what I had addressed to them in such manner as I should deem most proper ; but though I might have been induced to set forth, in some form, the view that I had given of the laws of Christ, and of Methodistic law, as applying to our present agitations and the agitators, I should have hesitated long before I exposed a member of my flock, however erring and sinful, if he had not exposed himself. Mr. Harrison has chosen to make public his "expulsion from the Wesleyan society," and to give a lengthened account of what occurred on that occasion. As far as it concerns myself, I do not complain of that account ; but his report of that part of the proceedings which took place after he had chosen to withdraw from the Meeting, conveys no adequate or correct idea, either of the law which I endeavoured to expound, or that violation of it of which I complained ; and his remarks on some respectable members of the Meeting are not correct, and might have been spared. In giving the objections which were raised by Mr. Harrison, and the exceptions which he took to certain parts of the proceedings instituted against him, I have employed principally his own words : I could not in the same manner adopt his report in giving the replies to his objections. Some things he has plainly forgotten ; and in other instances, my own distinct recollection of what was said required me to make some variation. I have not aimed to give every sentence uttered in that conversation, nor every remark made ; but I have given, I believe, all the main points. The subsequent part I had prepared in writing, and can therefore attest its correctness.

By some parties I am represented as having acted vindictively in this matter. This I entirely deny. They must consult their own heart, and receive instruction from that source, who impute to me that principle. The question with me has been, Is any man, however otherwise respectable, to be retained in our branch of Christ's church, who sets at nought any of Christ's laws ; or, ought he to be recognised

as a Wesleyan, who tells the people with whom he is united, that their laws are all, or nearly all, without authority, and that he will not regard them? Some men, out of a tenderness which would sacrifice law, and order, and right, to feeling, may plead for this absurdity; and men who would like to see enemies retained in the house, because they would like to see the house in flames and reduced to ashes, will reclaim against their expulsion as arbitrary and tyrannous; but wise and right-hearted persons will say that self-respect, as well as self-preservation, must lead a people, possessed of understanding, to remove from their fellowship their intestine foes. I am accused, too, of attacking, in the person of Mr. Harrison, the public press. No one can *fairly* come to such a conclusion. Mr. Harrison's connexion with the newspaper which he conducts, was not the only offence alleged against him. Then our country's laws set limits to the freedom of the press, which it cannot exceed with impunity; and the Christian law which declares us "*free*," commands that the "*liberty*" shall not be "*used as a cloke of maliciousness*." The view taken by the Islington Leaders'-Meeting, and expressed by their vote, was, that in his paper, Mr. Harrison has "*indulged a licence which no member of our society, and no Christian, ought to indulge*." The question then was, not whether a gentleman of the press may conduct his journal as he pleases; but whether an editor, choosing to conduct it with hostility to the laws and legislative authority of Methodism, and with bitter reviling of his Ministers, *ought to be retained as a member of our religious community, and allowed to occupy our pulpits?* The church has a right, and is commanded, to judge its own members: over them "*that are without*" it has no jurisdiction,—"*them God judgeth*." Our churches have a *right* to peace, and that right ought to be protected, by the removal of the refractory from among us. A Christian church without discipline, or where its members agree to abandon discipline, had better, as soon as possible, renounce the name.

JOHN SCOTT.

LONDON, *February 21st*, 1850.

## WESLEYAN DISCIPLINE,

&c.

---

MR. JOHN HARRISON, Editor of the "Wesleyan Times" newspaper, having been informed by the REV. JOHN SCOTT, Superintendent Minister of the Eighth London Circuit, that he felt it to be his duty to prefer certain charges against him before the ISLINGTON LEADERS'-MEETING, and should do so on the evening of Tuesday, January 22d, and having had the charges communicated to him in writing, Mr. Harrison attended the Leaders'-Meeting on that evening. . He was accompanied by his Solicitor.

When the Meeting had been commenced by prayer, Mr. Harrison said, as he was summoned on charges which not only affected his standing in the Wesleyan Society, and as a Local Preacher in the body, but might also have a prejudicial influence on his position in civil society, and interfere with the means by which he lived; and as the charge\* was grounded on his connexion with a public journal; he claimed to be heard by his legal adviser.

He was told that that was a church-meeting, called to consider matters which related to the interests of the church of Christ. The Meeting could not consent to carry on its inquiry under apprehension of legal proceedings; the members must be quite at liberty faithfully to perform their duty. There was no wish to injure Mr. Harrison's position in society. It was unprecedented for legal gentlemen to attend on such occasions; and it was decided that in the present case it could not be allowed.

MR. HARRISON stated, that he had a Reporter in attendance, and wished to have his assistance to take notes for him.

MR. SCOTT objected to the presence of any one who was not a member of the Meeting. He himself was provided with no short-hand writer. They were not afraid of their proceedings being known, but care must be taken that the world be not allowed to rule the proceedings and decisions

\* That is, *one* of the two charges.

of the church. He could not be a party to such a precedent. Mr. Harrison was told, that any members of the Meeting that he might request to do so would assist him in taking notes.

MR. HARRISON objected to the competency of the Leaders'-Meeting to deal with his case. He was a Local Preacher, and amenable to the Local-Preachers' Meeting. That Meeting was competent to deal with his case, being a court of peers; and he quoted and commented on the rule, "That no person shall receive a Plan as a Local Preacher without the approbation of a Local-Preachers' Meeting."

He was told, that the charges brought against him affected him not merely as a Local Preacher, but as a member of Society. If he ceased to be a member of Society, all the offices he held would become void, as a matter of course.

MR. HARRISON.—Except that of Trustee.

MR. SCOTT.—And that too, eventually, as provision is made in most chapel-deeds, that, upon the next filling up of the trust-deed, Trustees, no longer members of Society, shall be relieved by the remaining Trustees from pecuniary responsibility, and superseded in the trust by the substitution of some other person.

MR. HARRISON objected to the presence in the Meeting of any Travelling Preacher, not being a Leader, except the Superintendent of the Circuit.

MR. SCOTT said, that the two of his colleagues who were not Leaders in that Society, were, with his other brethren, *co-Pastors*, and were interested, equally with himself, in everything that occurred in the Society; they were also, like himself, pledged to "observe and enforce our discipline" in the Circuit. They only wished to do what was right, and not to take any advantage against Mr. Harrison; but he (Mr. Scott) wished to have, and the Meeting to have, the presence and counsel of his brethren in the inquiry now before them.

MR. RATTENBURY.—I claim to be here on the authority of the New Testament, independently of everything else. I am a Pastor, and, as such, have to give an account of souls; therefore I am bound to exercise an oversight of the flock. I am also here by virtue of the rule affixed to the heading of the Stations:—"The Superintendent and other Minister or Ministers stationed in or appointed to the several Circuits undermentioned, is and are appointed by the Conference to preach, and to perform all acts of religious worship and Methodist discipline, in each and every of the Wesleyan-Methodist chapels already erected,



or to be erected, within each Circuit respectively, within the space of twelve calendar months, *at such time or times, and in such manner, as to him or them shall seem proper*; subject nevertheless to the Superintendent Minister."

MR. HARRISON.—From even the Minutes of 1835, respecting guards against rash expulsion, it is implied that your colleagues have no right to be present and vote. The clause I refer to is this:—"Every case of proposed expulsion shall be brought by the Superintendent before the weekly meeting of the Preachers, in order that he may have the opinion and advice of his colleagues and co-Pastors before he shall finally decide on the course he ought to adopt." From this it appears evident that the Preachers were not supposed to be present at the trial. Again: In a trial of one Mr. Jones, which occurred at Southwark, objection was taken to the presence of the Preachers, Messrs. Bunting and Grindrod; and as no law could be brought to prove their right to take part in the proceedings, they both retired. Again: They have all signed the President's Declaration, and are, consequently, absolutely committed against me.

MR. SCOTT said, it was not always convenient for all the Ministers in a Circuit to be present at such an investigation; but whether present or not, there was reason to be guarded against any improper exercise of discipline, by taking time for counsel and consideration. He did not know the Southwark case, and therefore would make no remark upon Mr. Harrison's statement. *He*, as well as his colleagues, had signed the Declaration; but they were not for that reason committed against Mr. Harrison, unless he were committed against Methodism.

MR. HARRISON took exception to the presence of the female Leaders at the Meeting. He thought that it was scarcely fit that, with their sensibilities, they should be present and called to vote, when the individual who might be expelled at the Meeting would be committed to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

MR. SCOTT said, that the females who were Leaders were equally interested with the men who held the same office; they had a number of members under their care, and many of those members had families. He wished *all the Leaders* thoroughly to understand the principles and ground of this proceeding,—the female Leaders as well as the others,—to enable them to inform other members of society, when information might be useful. As members of the Meeting they had a right to be present, and to vote,

if they thought proper. He wondered at Mr. Harrison's objection, as in case of wrong or hardship he would, from their very sensibilities to which he had referred, be likely to have their sympathies in his favour.

MR. HARRISON objected to Mr. Scott's appearing as accuser and judge. No man could sustain two such opposite offices. It was unseemly, and contrary to the usage of every court of law, civil or penal, in civilized countries. The judge was always supposed to be on the prisoner's side, (see Mr. Wesley's "Twelve Rules of a Helper," rule 5,) and this cannot be when he brings the accusation.

MR. SCOTT was aware that such objection would probably be made; and to escape it he might have requested one of his colleagues, or some member of the Meeting, to bring forward the charges. *He* had, however, been intrusted with the care of the societies in that Circuit, and was bound in faithfulness to enforce the discipline of the body. He had a decided conviction that Mr. Harrison was wrong; and he thought it the most honest and manly way to say so, and himself to bring forward the accusation, rather than desire some one else to do it, and pretend to an indifference which he did not feel. He took that to be the right Methodist and scriptural course, and they were bound to administer the discipline in that manner rather than after the manner of mere civil processes.

MR. HARRISON remarked, that Mr. Scott had not observed the scriptural rule, "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone." Mr. Harrison felt this sensibly, as, for some time, severe affliction had been in his house.

MR. SCOTT had never regarded Mr. Harrison's fault as between himself and Mr. Harrison; and he could not now so regard it. "If thy brother shall trespass *against thee*." This was no trespass against him individually, (Mr. Scott,) but a trespass against the whole Connexion. Before, however, he made any public complaint, he did call at Mr. Harrison's house, purposely to converse with him, and admonish him on the course which he was pursuing; and he thought Mr. Harrison's remark to a friend respecting that call was not quite generous. It was to the effect, that "Mr. Scott called at a time when he knew he (Mr. Harrison) would be from home;" the reverse of which was the fact, for he purposely chose a time for the call when he thought that he most probably would meet with Mr. Harrison. This imputation, and the knowledge that private conversations have frequently been perverted in the warfare that

has been carried on against Ministers of the body, made him less anxious for any private interview with Mr. Harrison. Considering the hostile position which Mr. Harrison had taken, he could scarcely expect that he could pay friendly visits. At two successive Local-Preachers' Meetings, however, he had distinctly expressed his objections to Mr. Harrison's conduct, and at the last Meeting remonstrated with him as acting contrary to Methodism and Christianity.

MR. HARRISON said,—In the introduction to the letter which I received from you, you say, that by accepting membership in the Wesleyan Society, and by accepting also a place among the Local Preachers, I had virtually bound myself to abide by the rules of the Society. Now, if such was the case, which I admit, then by giving me my quarterly ticket the first week in December last, and addressing me as "brother Harrison," and by sending me the Local-Preachers' Plan, the first week in January, also addressed, in your own handwriting, "brother Harrison," you accepted me as a member and Local Preacher, and by that act "condoned" for any offence prior, at least, to the former of those dates. Anything, therefore, which can now be gone into must have reference to subsequent matters.

MR. SCOTT said, he gave Mr. Harrison his ticket and also his Plan, because he was yet a member of Society. In renewing his ticket he owned he did not feel so free a heart in recognising him as a member as he would have liked to feel, knowing the part he was acting; yet he thought it right to treat him as a member and Local Preacher, so long as no charge had been preferred against him. He thought Mr. Harrison ought not to blame him for this forbearance. Had he done otherwise, and withheld his ticket or Plan, would not Mr. Harrison have taken great exception, and complained that his case had been prejudged and prejudiced in consequence? and he might have justly accused him before the District-Meeting.

MR. W. HARRIS asked, whether, as a matter of fact and usage, the plan generally was not to refuse to give the ticket in the class to persons against whom a charge was made, or to withhold the Plan, until such time as the trial shall have taken place, merely suspending the member in the interim; and whether the usage of Methodism was not, that the renewing the ticket and giving the Plan was an acknowledgment of continuity of membership?

MR. SCOTT said, that when the tickets were renewed, if a Leader stated some case of immorality against a member, which was generally believed, the ticket might be with-

held, and the member left to appeal, if he thought proper, to a Leaders'-Meeting. But in cases like the present, the usage was to proceed by a formal charge and proof which should satisfy the Meeting, before there was any interference with membership.

MR. HARRISON wished to know, whether the Leaders were judges only of the fact, or of the law also ; whether they were competent to deal with the whole case ?

MR. RATTENBURY read an extract from the Minutes of Conference, vol. vii., p. 579, which thus concludes :—

If a majority of the Leaders, who vote at the Meeting, (upon the trial of a member,) shall be "satisfied" that sufficient proof is adduced to establish the fact of a wilful and habitual negligence, or of the violation of some Scriptural or Methodistical rule, and shall give a verdict to that effect, then the Leaders'-Meeting has discharged *its whole part* of the painful duty to be performed, and the case is left in the hands of the Superintendent. On *him* devolves, in his pastoral character, as the person whose peculiar call and province it is to "watch over that soul" as one that "must give an account," the sole right and duty of deciding on the measures to be adopted towards the offender, in consequence of the verdict thus pronounced, &c., &c.

MR. HARRISON.—Late editions of the laws of 1797 make the Leaders judges only of the *fact* ; but the edition of the rules published in 1800, a copy of which I have in my hands, makes the Leaders judges of both *law* and *fact*. I will read the rule : "No Leader or Steward can be *put out of his place*, but by a majority of Leaders, or a Quarterly Meeting ; neither can any member of the Society be *excluded but by a majority at a Leaders'-Meeting*.\*

\* The old contention which was ardently carried on in 1828 and 1829, and in 1835 and 1836, is thus revived. The rules, as found in the collected Minutes of Conference, vol. i., p. 375, stand thus :—"No person shall be appointed a Leader or Steward, or be removed from his office, *but in conjunction with the Leaders'-Meeting*." "No person shall be expelled from the society for immorality, till such immorality *be proved at a Leaders'-Meeting*." This is the exact wording of these rules, as found in the copy of the Minutes which was exhibited in Chancery, under the letter F, in Dr. Warren's suit, and verified by affidavit, and which was evidently *printed in 1797*, the very year when the rules were enacted. The "rule" quoted by Mr. Harrison seems a *comment* rather than the rule, saying what cannot be done as the law stands ; and it is strictly true : no member of society can be excluded "but by a majority at a Leaders'-Meeting," *being satisfied that the charge is proved*. This interpretation of the law, as made in 1797, the Conference declared and made authoritative in 1835. The REV. JAMES H. RIGG, in his able Essay on the Principles of Wesleyan Methodism, gives an analogous form of expression from BLACKSTONE. Treating of trial by jury, the Judge says, "In MAGNA CHARTA it is more than once insisted upon, as the bulwark of our liberties, that no freeman shall be hurt, in either his PERSON or his PROPERTY, but *by the legal judgment of his equals, or the law of the land*." "What now would be thought," says Mr. Rigg, "of one who

MR. SCOTT said, discussion of this question had been carried on years ago, until he believed the Connexion was weary of it. The Declaratory Minute in 1835 was made to determine the meaning.

MR. HARRISON wished to have it stated upon what law he was to be tried.

MR. SCOTT would inform him very soon: the basis of the law which he applied to the case was in the Bible.

MR. HARRISON.—On any other law? and on what particular Connexional law?

MR. SCOTT.—He would see in a short time.

MR. HARRISON.—It will not take you a minute to state the law.

MR. SCOTT.—Yes, it will: it cannot be explained in a minute. The law to be applied is, in the first instance, the word of God; and then such of our rules, based upon it, as apply to the case.

MR. HARRISON.—If I am to be tried on the law (so called) of 1835, I decidedly object to it.

MR. RATTENBURY.—Did you object to that law when you became a Methodist?

MR. HARRISON.—I became a Methodist *before* such laws were made. I had never seen such laws, nor did I know of their existence until within the last few years; nay, I do not know that my acquaintance with them extends over two years, and therefore I cannot now consent to be tried on them.\* The laws of 1797 are *the laws* of the Connexion, having been agreed to by the people. The Conference of that year, in their Address to the Societies, stated that they had “carefully revised the rules,” and they were then given as “the whole at large.” The

should contend, from the expression cited here, that the jury ought in all cases to fix the *sentence* as well as find the *verdict*?” (P. 22.)

\* This acknowledgment is instructive. Mr. Harrison has been, he says, a member of society for twenty years, and a Local Preacher for fourteen years; yet, until lately, he did not know of those laws, which now in his paper he denounces as unjust, oppressive, and tyrannical. For nearly twenty years he felt no chafing, no pressure,—nothing to disturb the peaceful enjoyment of his Methodistic privileges, or his peaceful and useful discharge of his Methodistic duties. It was not until within some two or three years, when he became connected with a factious party in Methodism, and had to provide material for a factious public journal, that his eyes were opened to see the great injustice, and he began to feel the excessive hardship, which the Wesleyans endure under the tyrannical rule of oppressive Ministers and bad laws. Is there not another cause to be assigned for his present denunciations rather than something amiss in the system? This, according to his own showing, was so mild, that for years he was unconscious even of the existence of what now he denounces.

"Rules of Society" were the only Rules ever given to me, which were put into my hands when I became a member, and these I have endeavoured to keep. My subscription has never been given to the laws (so called) of 1835.

MR. HARRISON then read a written paper, in which he protested against being tried on any charges based on the law of 1835,—(he was repeatedly told that the *holy Scriptures* would be adduced as the *basis* of all the law that would be alleged against him,)—or on any laws *antecedent* or *subsequent* to the laws of 1797. He denied that the Conference could scripturally make any new laws for the church: its legislative functions were confined within its own walls. Especially he objected to that part of the Connexional economy which restricts the function of the Leaders'-Meeting to a finding whether, to their satisfaction, the charges are proved; (though such was the law of 1797;) and declared, that if the Meeting did not determine the sentence as well as find the verdict, he would retire from the Meeting.

MR. SCOTT said, Mr. Harrison's objections were not new; they could be answered, and had been so in former years: they were now met, however, not to discuss the laws, but to observe and administer them.

MR. RATTENBURY.—It is a very strange thing that Mr. Harrison should not be acquainted with these laws. Mr. Harrison has been for more than three years a reformer of Methodist laws, and yet he appears not to have known what they were. But it is all of a piece with many other things,—people agitating about what they know nothing of.

MR. HARRISON was informed, that if he left the Meeting, the case would proceed just as though he were present; when, after some further conversation, he retired.

MR. SCOTT then said, the orderly way of proceeding would be now to read the communication which he had been induced, by a sense of duty, to send to Mr. Harrison. It was then read as follows:—

*To Mr. John Harrison.*

DEAR SIR,

You are a member of the Wesleyan Society, and a Local Preacher in the Eighth London Circuit; and, by accepting membership in the body, and renewing it from quarter to quarter,—also by accepting a place among the Local Preachers, and taking upon you the engagements required of those who fill that office,—you have agreed to be governed by the Rules of the Wesleyan Society.



As Secretary to the "London Corresponding Committee," Editor of the newspaper called the "Wesleyan Times," and a party to the holding of public meetings for the agitation of the Wesleyan Societies, you are openly violating the order, and inciting the members of Society, and especially persons holding office among us, to a general violation of the order, of our community; you are pursuing a course contrary to our rules and the word of God, and which, so far as you may succeed, must be destructive of the peace, unity, and religion of the Wesleyan Societies.

And further:

In the newspaper of which you are the Editor, you have, in continuance, indulged a licence which no member of our Society, and no Christian, ought to indulge; and this especially, by the disregard which you have shown for truth, the avidity with which you have insinuated evil against divers persons, and published evil reports of those to whom you are opposed, the calumnious matter which you have inserted against the body of Wesleyan Ministers, and the slander and abuse which you have directed against individuals of that body,—all of which are contrary to the rules of our religious Society, and to the word of God.

Charged as I am, in conjunction with my colleagues, with the pastoral oversight of the Societies in this Circuit, and "pledged to observe and enforce the discipline" of the body of which we form a part, I feel it to be my duty to bring the above charges against you before the Islington Leaders'-Meeting. I hereby give you notice, that I shall do so (D. V.) on Tuesday evening next, January 22d, and request that you will then be present to answer to these charges. The Meeting will commence at eight o'clock. I am,

Yours, &c.,

JOHN SCOTT.

*St. George's-Terrace, Islington,  
January 16th, 1850.*

MR. SCOTT then addressed the Meeting as follows:—

Dear Brethren,—Every society, whether civil or religious, must have its system of order,—without which it cannot cohere. If the society be well constituted, the members severally must have their position, relations, and sphere of duty; no one must interfere with the orderly movements of the others, nor with the general order of the society. Law is the parent of order; it determines men's position, relations, and duties, and it is especially import-

ant in two respects : In a religious society, to a God-fearing man who wishes to be right, it is invaluable instruction,—a “light to his feet, and a lantern to his path ;” and to those whose spirit is “lawless and disobedient,” it is salutary restraint.

We are a religious society. We have our laws, assigning to us our duties in our several positions. We have our established system of order, which allows great freedom of action in doing well : though, even here, our laws of order impose restraint ; for a member may not lawfully obtrude himself into certain offices, even on the plea of usefulness, until duly appointed and authorized ; and they impose checks and prohibitions directly a man errs and does evil. In Islington we are at peace. Thanks are due especially to God for this ;—He has, in a most gratifying degree, given us to be of “one heart and one way.” Thanks to you, my Christian brethren,—you have set the flock a good example, for you have kept aloof from the strife of men,—you have upheld our Christian order, and followed after “the things that make for peace.” Thanks, also, to the members of our Islington Society,—they have acted with a wisdom similar to your own, and they remain, I believe, affectionately attached to their Ministers and the institutions of Methodism. But I cannot add, Thanks to Mr. Harrison and Mr. Dresser for our present peace. They were parties to the calling of a public meeting, contrary to our rules and order, and brought among us a disturbing agency, and the elements of discord. They held out a lure to our people to attend their meeting, by advertising it as “a meeting of office-bearers, members, and friends of the Wesleyan Society in the Eighth London Circuit,” as if, contrary to truth, there was a general concurrence of office-bearers, &c., in calling the meeting. But even this did not, by God’s mercy, disturb us. We have held our wonted solemnities at the close of the past and opening of the present year in the spirit of unity and love. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity !”

But we are part of a much larger Society ; or, rather, we are one of a large number of united Societies. These Societies have, with us, one system of doctrinal truth ; one system of church-order ; one code of principles and laws for our common government ; and, ordinarily, as a people we are so united that there

“Subsists as in us all one soul,”—



we are a Connexion. At present, however, there is extensive disturbance in the Connexion; and a process is in operation of alienating instead of uniting the people's hearts. I accuse Mr. Harrison of having, for a long time, contributed to excite that disturbance. He is Editor of a newspaper which is read and has influence in our community, and the influence is baneful. It flatters the people as intelligent, wise, pious, everything excellent; it defames the Ministers, and represents them to the people as caring for them only for their own selfish ends; and the Local Preachers it seeks especially to make the enemies of the Travelling Preachers. I have forborne to bring this accusation before you, until I am thoroughly convinced that longer forbearance would be unfaithfulness on my part, and injustice, and a great injury, to our Connexion. I now, therefore, proceed to present the case to the Meeting, and ask your judgment of the truth of what I have to allege. The charges are grave. I am bound to show you, that I make them on sufficient ground; and you are bound in duty carefully to weigh and consider what I advance, that, on the one hand, you may not convict if the case be not made out, and, on the other hand, that you may honestly say so, if the charges are proved. You will perceive that I have written what I shall now address to you. I have done so for two reasons. I wish to express myself guardedly in what I shall say; and, if I am misrepresented, I wish to have at my command the certain and accurate means of correction.

In directing your attention to the first charge, I shall commence by placing before you those principles and laws of our holy religion, and of our religious Society, by which you are to judge of the questions which you are to determine, and against which I regard Mr. Harrison as having seriously offended. My first appeal is to God's HOLY WORD. To the Bible we *must* defer; for by that book we must all be *judged at the last*.

In that last most memorable conversation which Christ held on earth with his disciples, there are two passages which I will read.

John xiv. 27: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you." Just before He suffers, the Redeemer *gives—bequeaths* his peace to his church;—it is left the church's inheritance; and every one, converted to Christ, and joining His church, has a *right* to peace. "In the world," harassed by its cares, and amidst its tossings and agitations, "ye shall

have tribulation," said He: "in me," and in the bosom of my church, "ye shall have peace."

John xiii. 34: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." Love one to another,—love that "is kind," that "envieth not," that "doth not behave itself unseemly," that "seeketh not her own," that "thinketh no evil," that "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth,"—with this love Christ commands His disciples to love one another. It is to connect and bind them together in one body.

The *esteem in which God holds peace* is remarkably shown in two passages which I will quote.

Matt. v. 9: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." The holy and blessed God, infinitely happy in Himself, delighting in the happiness of His creatures, and knowing that the foundation of all happiness is peace, calls the "peacemakers" His "children;" which is evidently appropriate, for He is repeatedly called in Scripture "the God of peace," (Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xiii. 20,) and the peacemaker partakes of His nature, and breathes His Spirit.

2 Cor. xiii. 11: "Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

This is true Christian society. The members strictly united in one mind and heart, and God dwelling in the midst, "the tabernacle of God with men,"—this is heaven on earth.

I will now quote a passage which will show you that this state of society is *not ideal*; that in the economy of grace *provision is made for producing this state of things*.

Rom. xiv. 17: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and *peace*, and joy in the Holy Ghost." The sway of God set up in man's heart converts him, reconciles him to God, reduces his will and his passions to subjection, to order, and peace; and makes him the child of peace, and of the God of peace. Here two lessons are plain. If the members of the church be in heart subject to the divine sway, they will be of a peaceful spirit: those who trouble the church are persons whom Christ does not govern,—they are not subject to His sceptre of peace.

I next recite to you some divine *commands*, enjoining on all saints *the duty of maintaining peace*.

The first is an ancient one, showing that "the God of peace" has always loved peace, and required his people to maintain it.

Psalm xxxiv. 14: "Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it,"—do not drive it away.

Mark ix. 50: "Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another," says our divine Lord and Master. His followers are not required to be tame and insipid: they may have spirit and zeal; but they must "have peace one with another."

Rom. xii. 18: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."

Heb. xii. 14: "Follow peace with all men."

Eph. iv. 3: "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

We are next shown in holy Scripture *how* Christians are to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit inviolate,—the bond of peace unbroken.

Rom. xiv. 19: "Let us, therefore, follow after the things that make for peace; and things wherewith one may edify another." A Christian can easily judge what things make for peace, and what for dissension.

Titus iii. 9: "But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law;" (the law of 1835, if you please;) "for they are unprofitable and vain."

1 Tim. i. 4: "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith." Contentions among Christians are evil; and these requirements show how carefully they are to avoid all causes of contention.

2 Tim. ii. 22: "Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart."

Eph. v. 2: "Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."

Col. iii. 12—15: "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved"—Let us remember, brethren, our high and holy designation,—we are "the elect of God," "holy and beloved,"—God has chosen us to holiness. In the region of strife and contention this is forgotten; men throw the sacredness of their character to the winds, and feel and speak and act like men of the world: it will not be forgotten here. "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering; forbearing one

another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any : even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. *And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to which also ye are called in one body.*" Let these instructions be faithfully followed by all members of the church, and we shall have neither disunion nor discord.

I will read to you another passage, showing *how the peace of the church is often broken ; how those who break it are characterized in holy Scripture ; and what evils arise from the means which breakers of the peace adopt.*

\* 1 Tim. vi. 3—5 : " If any man consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," commanding, for instance, peace and love, " and to the doctrine which is according to godliness ; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmises, perverse disputings " (" gallings one of another," marginal reading) " of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness : from such withdraw thyself."

St. James further characterizes the state of things thus produced. James iii. 16 : " Where envying and strife is, there is confusion," (" tumult or unquietness," marginal reading,) " and every evil work." And says St. Paul, " God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." (1 Cor. xiv. 33.) Men may pretend that they seek the glory of God, when, in the spirit of strife, they are sacrificing peace and producing confusion ; but the Holy Spirit of God has no hand in this work.

I will quote one other passage of holy Scripture : it is St. Paul's instruction to the church, with reference to those who disturb and divide it.

Rom. xvi. 17, 18 : " Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned ; and avoid them. For they which are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly ; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." This is a remarkable passage. " They that cause divisions serve not our Lord Jesus Christ," though they may pretend to do so ; that Christ has no servants so holy, so wise, so disinterested and single-minded, so zealous, so intent upon His glory, as themselves. They may pretend that they serve our Lord Jesus Christ,—but they serve " their own belly ;"

—they make their divisive work a source of emolument,—they earn a livelihood by it,—or secure a provision from it. This is very plain language, and some may be bold enough to call it coarse expression; but it is the language of an inspired Apostle, and we must believe it *truly* characterizes the feelings of low selfishness which will commonly actuate those who divide the church of Christ. Their prey will be the simple, whose hearts, by good words and fair speeches, they deceive. “Mark” these, says the Apostle, “and avoid them.”

Now Christ having thus constituted and ordained His church to be the mansion of peace; having established in every converted man's heart his kingdom of peace, and given His Holy Spirit to dwell in him, whose “fruit” is “peace” and “love;” having charged every member religiously to maintain it, by avoiding in spirit and in action all things that either destroy it or put it to hazard, and to live and act in the spirit of peace and love; would it consist with these explicit and repeated determinations of holy Scripture for a Christian church to set no restrictions to the whims, caprices, eccentricities, and passions of its members,—but to leave them quite free to moot in the church, any where, and at any time, questions which must lead to debate, and probably to strife and contention? Ought a member, whenever he may think himself aggrieved; or, with no grievance of his own of which to complain, whenever he thinks some one else has cause of complaint; or whenever he quarrels with something in the church-system of the people whom he has joined,—should such a person, in any church, especially in a number of churches associated under one government like ours, be at liberty to connect himself with others, call public meetings, liberate his own passions from restraint, and, by appeals to the passions of the people, stir up and excite resentment, hatred and wrath? Can this consist with the Christian law? Ought Leaders'-Meetings, and Quarterly-Meetings, to be dragged into the discussion of any question of our general polity, whenever a man is found who has lost his religion, cares nothing for religion in others, has drunk deeply into the spirit of worldly politics, and seeing nothing right in any system of church order, unless it be modelled according to the most liberal political notions of the day, is pleased to moot such a question? Would any member, who has alive in his soul the spirit of religion, and expects to come away from a meeting of Christian men with his religious feelings

not injured but improved,—would any godly man long hold office in such a state of things? Ought any one long to be *tolerated* in a Christian Society, even as a private member, who is known secretly to sow disaffection and strife among the members of the church,—to disunite and estrange hearts, instead of uniting them?

Prov. vi. 16—19: “These six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, *and he that soweth discord among brethren.*”

With these words and commands of God in Scripture, can it be wondered that Mr. Wesley said to one of his Preachers, “You must needs expel from the Society those who will be contentious?” (Wesley’s Works, vol. xiv., p. 208.) To the same he says again, “When you have to do with those stubborn spirits, it is absolutely necessary either to mend them or end them; and *ten* persons of a quiet temper are better than *thirty* contentious ones.” (Wesley’s Works, vol. xiv., p. 209.) To another, he says, “Mark all those who would set you one against the other. Some such will never be wanting. But give them no countenance; rather ferret them out, and drag them into open day.” (Wesley’s Works, vol. xii., p. 309.)

Just after Mr. Wesley’s death, great commotions were stirred up in the societies by Mr. Kilham and others; large demands were made, in the name of the people, for liberty; and great abuse then, as now, was cast upon the body of Preachers, “*especially the seniors.*” They were such men as Mather, Pawson, Thompson, Bradburn, Benson, Bradford, Moore, who were represented “as ‘tyrants and oppressors,’ and the other Preachers but mere ‘ciphers.’” (Minutes of Conference, vol. i., p. 361.) But in seeking to repress the strife and contention which had been produced, and bring back the Connexion to peace, with the laws of the New Testament which I have quoted before them, they could not leave every member or officer in the Society to raise questions, and force debate at his pleasure, and so create agitation and strife; they therefore set up safe-guards to peace and unity. And we find in the Minutes of Conference the following rules:—

1795. For the peace of the whole body we also resolve, that if any Local Preacher, Trustee, Steward, or Leader shall *disturb the peace of the Society*, by speaking for or against the introduction of the Lord’s Supper, or concerning the old or new plan, so called, the Superintendent of the Circuit, or the



majority of the Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders of the Society so disturbed, shall have authority to summon a meeting of the Travelling Preachers of the Circuit, and the Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders of that Society. Evidence shall be examined on both sides; and, if the charge be proved, the Superintendent Preacher shall expel from the Society the person so offending. (Minutes of Conference, vol. i., p. 325.)

1796. What can be done to prevent unruly or unthinking men from disturbing our people?

Let no man, or number of men, in our Connexion, on any account or occasion, circulate letters, *call meetings*, do, or attempt to do, any thing *new*, till it has first been appointed by the Conference. (Minutes, vol. i., p. 347.)

1797. 1. As the Leaders'-Meeting is the proper Meeting for the Society, and the Quarterly-Meeting for the Circuit, we think that other formal Meetings, in general, would be contrary to Methodist economy, and very prejudicial in their consequences: but,

2. In order to be as tender as possible, consistently with what we believe to be essential to the welfare of our Societies, we allow that other formal Meetings may be held, if they first receive the approbation of the Superintendent, and the Leaders' or Quarterly Meeting; provided also, that the Superintendent, if he please, be present at every such Meeting. (Minutes, vol. i., p. 376.)

In perfect keeping with the spirit of these Minutes, and with God's holy Word, is the following instruction to the whole body of Ministers, agreed to at the Conference of 1820. This forms part of a Code of Instructions, read at every Annual District-Meeting. The entire series is headed by the question,—

What measures can we adopt for the increase of spiritual religion among our Societies and congregations, and for the extension of the work of God in our native country?

In conducting our Leaders' and Quarterly Meetings, and all other official Meetings among us, let us affectionately and steadily discountenance the spirit of strife and debate, and promote in the management of all our affairs, both by our advice and example, the temper and manner of men who are acting for God in the service of his church. Let the introduction of all topics of useless or irritating discussion, not legitimately connected with the proper business of such Meetings, be prudently repressed. Let us remember that, in a large body, the only way to *live in peace* and comfort is to *walk by rule*, and (to use the language of MR. WESLEY) "not to mend our rules, but to keep them for conscience' sake." And while we readily and cheerfully protect all our members in Meetings in which we preside, in the exercise of such functions as belong to them, according to our laws and general usages, let us not forget that we are under solemn obligations to conduct ourselves on such occasions, not as the mere *Chairmen* of public Meetings, but as the *Pastors* of Christian societies put in trust by the ordinance of God, and by their own voluntary association with us, with the scriptural superintendence of their spiritual affairs, and responsible to the great Head of the church for the faithful discharge of the duties of that trust. (Minutes of Conference, vol. v., p. 152, No. 26.)

Brethren, our calumniators find a bad motive for those rules of Methodism, which subject the expression of peo-

ple's opinions to restriction: "The Conference seek," it is said, "gradually and imperceptibly to increase their own power, and enslave the people." This is pure calumny. The Preachers have their own souls to save, and the people have theirs to save. We shall all have work enough to secure this great end, with all the assistance which church connexions, and church means and influences, in their holiest form can afford: we cannot, we ought not to, consent that our church connexion shall be made adverse to this great result, and turned into means of evil. The true motive of the Conference is ingenuously and truly given in the question which I have read,—the wish to preserve their own and the people's attention undiverted, to the increase of spiritual religion in the Societies and congregations, and the extension of the work of God in the world. Fixing our attention and our hearts on these objects, and leaving questions of doubtful disputation to others, the Methodists have been blessed and made a blessing. May they have grace from God steadfastly to "walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing!"

We now come to the memorable years, 1834 and 1835, —a time very much resembling the present. There was then the "Christian Advocate" newspaper, working all the mischief it could, attacking persons and personal character with every kind of reviling and abuse, as we have now the "Wesleyan Times." There were Dr. Warren and others, holding public Meetings throughout the country to agitate the Societies, complaining of grievous wrongs, as there are now Mr. Everett, and others with him, pursuing a similar course. There was a confederation formed, called the "Grand Central Association," by combination and numbers to compel the Conference to change the Institutions of Methodism; as there is now the "London Corresponding Committee," seeking, in a similar way, to achieve a similar object. Prior to the assembling of the Conference in 1835, a Meeting of Laymen from all parts of the country, with a large number of Ministers, was held in Sheffield; and a day was spent in considering the state of the Connexion, and the demands for change which the leaders of the Association made upon the Conference. At that Meeting three Resolutions were passed, which were as follows:—

I. We deeply deplore the measures which have been adopted for the avowed purpose of agitating the various Societies forming our Connexion,—measures by which the work of God has been seriously interrupted, and the character of the body greatly injured; and we declare our conviction, that



the aspersions which have been cast upon the Conference in general, and upon several of its most influential and distinguished members in particular, are false and calumnious.

II. We state it as our deliberate and conscientious opinion, that it is the imperative duty of the Connexion faithfully and steadfastly to adhere to the great and long-established principles of original Methodism, and more particularly to those which prevent the introduction of lay-delegates into the Methodist Conference; which secure our Connexional union, which provide for the due exercise of the scriptural powers of the pastoral office, and which guarantee the purity and efficiency of the Christian ministry, by confiding to the Conference the care of its own members.

III. We most cheerfully and entirely confide in the wisdom, integrity, and liberality of the Conference, in reference to such a modification or explanation of some of the Rules of the body as the Conference may consider best adapted to meet the present and future circumstances of the Connexion, and to carry out into more effectual and extensive operation those tried principles of Wesleyan Methodism, every departure from which we most sincerely deprecate.\* (Minutes of Conference, vol. vii., p. 563.)

These Resolutions were signed on the spot by eighty-one laymen; the Document was then sent into the country for signature, when one hundred and twenty-seven signatures more were added to the previous number. These names all appear in the Minutes of Conference, 1835.

The Conference deliberated long and anxiously on all the questions that had been agitated, as well as on the state of the Connexion; and the results are given in the Minutes of that year. You may suppose that the methods taken to distract and disorganize the body were specially considered; but the Conference did not forget the laws of peace and unity given by Christ to his church, and they refused to surrender those laws to the agitators. I will read you an extract from the Minutes on this subject:—

In the preceding articles of this Document reference has been repeatedly made to the *law of God contained in the holy Scriptures*, as furnishing, in the trial of members, that *primary* standard of judgment by which the innocence or culpability of any particular facts adduced in evidence is ever to be determined. This principle, though obvious, and scarcely needing argumentative defence, the Conference have advisedly made prominent in this statement of their views. Any conduct in a man professing godliness, which can be shown to be decidedly condemned by the precepts and principles of the New Testament, is surely sufficient to justify, if persisted in, the application of a suitable ecclesiastical censure, or other penalty, to such an individual; even though it may not have been previously found necessary to make a distinct and specific rule of our own Society on that exact mode and form of delinquency. The New Testament *law of purity*, in reference both to the Pastors and members of the Christian church, and with respect both to doctrine and practice, its often-repeated *law of peace* and *godly quietness*, and its *laws of courtesy, brotherly kindness*, and *mutual charity*, as well as its direction that “all things” should “be done decently and in order,”

\* Only the second of the above Resolutions was read to the Meeting. They are now inserted in full, as being apposite at the present time.

and its requirement of reasonable submission on the part of church-members to the scriptural "rule" of those who are "over them in the Lord,"—these are *standing enactments* of the Gospel, binding on all Christian communities, and therefore binding on the Methodist Societies, without exception. Any obstinate violation of them must be suitably visited when proved; or else the authority of Jesus Christ himself, as the Lord and Master of our department of his spiritual house, will be criminally set at nought; and he will have just cause to say to the Ministers and Pastors of our community, as he did to one of old time, "I have somewhat against thee."

On considering, in connexion with these scriptural principles, the present state of several Circuits, and the system of organized agitation and disturbance in which certain persons have publicly threatened to proceed in the course of the coming year, the Conference deem it necessary to take this opportunity of explicitly declaring their views on that subject, and of giving such general directions to the Superintendents as the exigency appears to demand.

The self-called "Grand Central Association," considered as to its character of *confederacy* and *combination*, and its extensive schemes of disorder and mischief, is, in those respects, somewhat unusual and strange; and some other persons, also, avoiding a *formal* connexion with the Association, have applied themselves with unwonted activity and insidious concert to plans and efforts of factious agitation. Hence, some of the friends of good order have supposed that *new* rules were wanting to check these new forms of evil, and have called on the Conference to protect, by some additional enactments, the peaceable and well-disposed members of our numerous Societies from the menaced annoyance and insult. It should, however, be considered, that the circumstances which are most characteristic and essential in the constitution and conduct of the "Association," and in the proceedings of other agents of faction, are plainly contrary even to our *existing rules and usages*, and to those *principles* conservative of purity and peace which the Conference has ever recognised and guarded by strong enactments. Thus, in 1795, it was resolved, that any Local Preacher, Trustee, Steward, or Leader, who should disturb the peace of the Connexion by speaking for or against "the old or new plan," then the subject of eager contention, should be expelled from the Society. And in 1796 it was enjoined, that "no man or number of men in our Connexion should, on any account or occasion, be allowed to circulate letters, or call meetings," for the purpose of stirring up our people to divisive and innovating agitations. Such plans and proceedings, moreover, are plainly opposed to the supreme and unrepeatable *law of Christ* in the New Testament, already repeatedly referred to in this address. "Debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults," are there deprecated and condemned in the strongest and most affecting terms. We are enjoined to mark them that *cause divisions*: if any man that is called a brother be a *railer*, with such an one no not to eat; to live in peace, that the God of love and peace may be with us; to let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking be put away from us; to follow peace with all men; if it be possible, as much as in us lieth, to live peaceably with all men; to know them which labour among us, and are over us in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake, and be at peace among ourselves; to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; and, finally, to desire that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. St. James declares, that "where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work: but the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy; and the

fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." The Conference, for these reasons, deem it unnecessary at present to provide against these modern forms of offence by any new and more specific regulation; because so much of *moral evil* and *un-Christian practice* is involved in the plans and proceedings of the said Association, and of other similar confederacies, by whatever name disguised, that to give them countenance, or to co-operate with them, is to be a partaker and abettor of various palpable transgressions of the commandments of God, and a violator, in some instances, of the letter, and in others of the whole spirit and tenor, of our established rules. It is, therefore, hereby declared to be the unanimous judgment of the Conference, That any person, who, instead of *peaceably retiring* from our Connexion, if he decidedly disapprove of our system either of doctrine or discipline, and cannot conscientiously even *acquiesce* in them, endeavours to retain and to employ his position among us for the purposes of opposition and strife; or who continues, after due admonition, to be a member of the "Grand Central Association," or of any other confederacy formed for the object of systematic agitation; is guilty of a flagrant transgression of that *morality of the New Testament*, the observance of which was a principal condition of his admission into our Society, and must be considered to have justly forfeited his claim to the privileges of our religious fellowship. In applying to particular cases this righteous general rule, the Conference exhort all the Superintendents to exercise, in connexion with a holy firmness, the moderation and mercy of the Gospel; bearing long, and dealing tenderly, though faithfully, with the weak, the ill-informed, and the misled; while they do not shrink from the effectual execution of necessary Christian discipline on those who, by overt acts of hostility and disturbance, identify themselves as the leaders or open partisans of disaffection and faction. The sound and satisfied majority of our Societies—a majority, happily, so immense, as to render all comparative calculations unnecessary—have a just claim on us for protection in the quiet enjoyment of their religious privileges; a claim which some of them have most forcibly urged, and which it is our bounden duty to meet with a discreet, but decisive, enforcement of our discipline on those whom milder methods shall fail to reclaim from their course of disturbance and mischief. (Minutes of Conference, vol. vii., pp. 583—586.)

But now, in making scriptural rules to preserve the Societies in peace, has the Conference made itself inaccessible to the reasonable representations, by letter or memorial, of the people? By no means. An individual may address the Conference, and give them any "useful intelligence on whatever concerns themselves and their people." A Leaders'-Meeting may, at any time, address the Conference on the affairs of that particular Society, and a Quarterly-Meeting on the affairs of the Circuit. All the Connexional Funds are applied by Committees of Ministers and laymen in equal number, and they annually represent to the Conference their views of what will be for the interests of the department which they manage. What other conceivable subject is there left, on which to raise question and debate? Suppose some general law is wanting for *the government of our Societies at large*; or suppose there is some existing

law which is felt to be inconvenient, or deemed to be injurious, and it is thought that it should be modified or repealed; an occasion may arise when men well-affected to the constitutional principles of Methodism would like to express their sentiments to the Conference. Prior to the year 1835, a formal meeting *might* be held, *provided the Superintendent, and the Leaders' or Quarterly Meeting, consented to it*; but, in 1835, a Meeting to memorialize the Conference was *appointed and required* to be held, if any considerable portion of the people call for it. I grant that some guards are placed about this law: it may not be called because some one or two, of an innovating spirit, desire it. The Circuit and Society Stewards must—a considerable proportion of them, if not a majority—concur in thinking it desirable to hold such a meeting. The reason is obvious,—we are a Connexion,—a wide-spread Connexion. There ought to be some difficulty in the way of any one man disturbing a system which thousands value most dearly. Four hundred Circuits, each raising a question annually on the laws by which our Societies at large are governed, (and some half a score!) would occasion great debate, keep men's minds unsettled, and make peace and an undistracted attention to the duties of piety impossible. I will read you the preamble to this law, and you will judge of the reasonableness of what it sets forth:—

*Meetings for communication with the Conference by memorial, on subjects of local concern, or on the general laws of the Connexion.*

The spirit and substance of our *present* regulations and authorized usages on this subject, the Conference considers to be embodied in the following summary statement:—

1. The Conference have said, that they, as well as the District-Committees, will gladly receive useful intelligence and information, even from any individual member of the Society, "on whatever concerns themselves or their people." (See Minutes of 1796.)

2. "The *Leaders'-Meeting* is the proper Meeting for the Society, and the *Quarterly-Meeting* for the Circuit." (Minutes of 1797.) From those Meetings, therefore, the Conference will receive communications, whenever they deem it *necessary* to make them, on subjects connected with *the proper business of their own Societies, or of their own Circuits*, respectively.

3. After full discussion and deliberation, it was judged (in 1797) that "other formal Meetings, in general, would be contrary to the Methodist economy, and very prejudicial in their consequences." The grounds of this judgment were, doubtless, such as these: The "other formal Meetings," to which reference is made, are obviously *unnecessary* for the purposes of *individual* representations of fact, or for communication with the Conference on the really difficult and important affairs of a particular Society or Circuit; the fullest provision being made for all these cases by the preceding articles of the same Rule. If *unnecessary*, they are for *that* reason *undesirable*; because *occasions* of contention and debate ought not to be needlessly mul-

tiplied, especially in a *religious* society, which is bound by the law of Christ to "follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." Christians should rather sacrifice unessential points of opinion, or matters of personal predilection, than endanger, by an eager obtrusion of their own views, the maintenance of tranquillity and good feeling in the communities to which they belong. If the object of those who wish for the "other formal Meetings," to which the Minute of 1797 objects, be the suggestion of any improvements in our various public institutions, then, too, are they, generally speaking, as unnecessary as in the case of Society or Circuit business; for in all those institutions Committees are now appointed, in which Preachers and Laymen of unimpeachable integrity and intelligence have a place; which Committees have, as such, regular official communication with the Conference on every subject connected with their respective trusts and interests. "Other formal Meetings" cannot be needed, in order to obtain redress for the alleged misconduct or mal-administration of any particular Preacher or Preachers; because the most ample means of obtaining such redress are already secured to complaining parties *connected with the Circuit immediately concerned*, by our existing Rules respecting the trial of accused Preachers. It seems, then, that no very material and legitimate business remains for the "other formal Meetings" in question, except it be the transmission to the Conference of opinions respecting some desired change in the *general laws of the Connexion*. Now, it should be considered that frequent alterations in the laws of a religious community, when they have once been deliberately settled, are neither safe nor advantageous. Such questions should not be hastily or capriciously mooted, as they usually tend to "gender strifes," rather than to "godly edifying." A habit of petty, meddling, speculative legislation, would be a dire calamity. It is not good in matters of discipline, any more than of doctrine, to be "ever learning, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth;" ever making new laws, or trying to mend existing ones, instead of keeping those already in force, and endeavouring to turn them to the best account for the spiritual benefit of ourselves and others.

4. For reasons probably similar to those now stated, the Conference of 1797 did not feel themselves at liberty to establish or encourage "other formal Meetings." They did not, however, wholly prohibit them as matters of occasional occurrence; being willing, it appears, to provide, if possible, for the permanent tranquillity of the Connexion in circumstances extraordinary as well as ordinary. They therefore appended to the statement last quoted the following Rule:—

"In order to be as tender as possible, consistently with what we believe to be essential to the welfare of our Societies, *we allow that other formal Meetings may be held*, if they first receive the approbation of the Superintendent, and the Leaders' or Quarterly Meetings: provided also, that the Superintendent, if he please, be present at every such Meeting."

*The present Conference* have considered, with the most respectful attention, the wish which appears to have been of late revived among several of our sincere friends, that some direct and authorized medium of occasional communication with the Conference should now be provided for our people, in reference to a certain class of subjects which do indeed concern *the general laws*, and consequently the practical administration, of Methodism; but which, because they do not affect them in their individual capacity as members, nor yet relate strictly or directly to the local affairs of their particular Society or Circuit, cannot, for that reason, be made the topics of discussion or of memorial in the Leaders' or Quarterly Meetings, without violating a great and important general maxim, essential to a due observance of the



Christian *law of peace*, and to the orderly transaction of our public business ; viz., that every Meeting among us shall confine itself to its proper and definite province, do *its own work* in the spirit of piety and kindness, and refrain from interfering with the work of others. Anxious to maintain this maxim in its full authority, and concurring *generally* in all the reasons stated in the preceding article, as rendering "other formal Meetings" undesirable and unnecessary, (except, perhaps, on *very special* occasions,) this Conference are nevertheless solicitous, like their venerable predecessors of 1797, to meet, as far as the public peace and safety will permit, the *wish* above described. On careful deliberation, the Conference are of opinion that the *principle* of the concluding portion of the law of 1797, already quoted, will be found to furnish the best and most expedient means of accomplishing all that can be reasonably desired. But it must be confessed, that the *details* of the Rule, as it now stands, appear to be so vague, and otherwise defective, as to require considerable alteration and extension.

Then follows the enactment, Minutes of Conference, vol. vii., p. 588.

This law has been fiercely denounced in Mr. Harrison's paper, and the Conference has been reviled for enacting it, in a manner that would disgrace men making no pretensions to religion, as I shall afterwards show ; but I have seen no attempt fairly to meet these reasons for subjecting to regulation the introduction of even reasonable propositions, respecting which there is likely to be, in the Connexion at large, great difference of opinion.\*

I have now brought before you the Rules made to guard the order, peace, and brotherly love of our religious Society, and the scriptural principles and laws on which they are founded. *I have quoted largely from the holy Scriptures*, because, in their conflicts for change under the name of "Reform" in our Societies, men often seem altogether to forget that there is a Bible, and that its principles and laws are to govern us. I have thus largely quoted, because also I am deeply impressed with the conviction that so

\* When it is considered that the persons in a Circuit, meeting under this regulation to propose to the Conference some new law, or change of an existing one, are not proposing something *merely for the government of themselves*, but of the tens of thousands in our Connexion, a candid mind will admit, at once, that rash youth, and inconsiderate and presumptuous men, ought not to be put forward to talk and debate on the subjects ; but that age, intelligence, and wisdom should be selected for the service. Such are secured for this Meeting, as far as a Circuit can supply them, by the appointment of persons whom the Circuit-Meetings have elected to office as Stewards, and by the appointment from among permanent officers of those only to whom continued standing in the church has given character and influence. And as the Conference assembles only once a year, surely once a year is sufficiently often for such a Meeting to assemble.

many passages would not have been written enjoining peace, so many others commanding us to avoid everything tending to destroy peace; the Holy Spirit would not have denounced with so much severity the disturbers of peace, and commanded the church to "mark them," and "avoid them;" if, in the judgment of God, peace in the church were not all-important; and if He had not foreseen that it would be often in great danger from the differing opinions and passions of men. *You*, my brethren, will recollect that we have a Bible, and are bound to live by its precepts. It is easy to calumniate these laws which I have read, and the Conference for enacting them; but this, at least, can be affirmed,—no one can show that they are contrary to Scripture; or, that they go beyond the scriptural requirement. To demand a freedom beyond this, is to contend, not for *Christian* liberty, but for liberty to throw off the yoke of Christ, and enthrone *Discord* in His church, in the place of *Peace*. At all events, these *are* our laws; and Mr. Harrison consented to them, or he would not have been a member of Society. He now tells us that lately, and not before, he has understood our system, and he does not agree with our constitution. He is of opinion that the Conference has no right to be the Legislative Body for the Societies. Very well; but we are not bound to alter our constitution to meet his views; and he has no right to throw our whole body into convulsions, to effect the change. If he had regard to Christ's laws of peace and love, he would either quietly acquiesce in our regulations, or peacefully withdraw, and seek church-connexion with some body more agreeing with his views and feelings. But he has chosen to remain with us, and to disregard our laws of order and peace,—yea, to set them at defiance.

In bringing before you evidence of what I allege, I must read from his Paper. I make *some* difference in my own mind between leading articles, which must be taken as his own composition, or, at least, as having his special approval, and the letters of correspondents; but I must maintain that he is *responsible for these latter*, and that, as a member of our Society, and a Christian, he ought not to give insertion to letters notoriously unconstitutional, defamatory, malignant. The answers to correspondents, I take it, are to be considered as especially his own, or as having his especial sanction. I remark, too, that I would not make a man an offender for a word. In the best conducted journal you may sometimes find expressions that

you disapprove : I shall not therefore advertently dwell on light and trivial points.

The first extract which I shall give, is from the paper dated August 27th, in which Mr. Harrison recommends the people in the country to correspond with each other, and to hold a Meeting of delegates.

One thing pleases us exceedingly : while there has been no organization and no concerted movement, there is simultaneous expression of feeling and indications of action. But there must be co-operation and union. *Circuits should correspond with each other, and arrange for an aggregate Meeting of delegates*, to whom the whole question should be entrusted. Meanwhile, we recommend firmness, and the exercise of Christian temper. There will be much to provoke the friends of reform, but they must heed it not ; go on their way unmoved, and thus prove that they seek the real improvement of Methodism. They have much to encourage them. The public and the press is on their side, and if they *will* a reform, it must be conceded. The Preachers are powerful just now ; *but what the people made*, the people can *unmake*. We recommend that Meetings be held in every Circuit and every important town, and Committees formed. "Extraordinary times demand extraordinary measures."

Mr. Harrison is not content to seek the redress of any supposed grievance, or any improvement in Methodism, in a constitutional way ; but he directly incites the Societies to break through all rule and order, and collect in a large Meeting, in defiance of all Connexional regulations.

At the end of August *a Committee was organized*, and appointed to correspond with all the Circuits in Great Britain, with a view to a Meeting of delegates ; and Mr. Harrison was appointed one of the Secretaries of the Committee. September 3d, he publishes the following resolution respecting it :—

That, in the judgment of this Meeting, *the proceedings of the Conference, being a direct violation of the essential principles of civil and religious liberty*, justify the Wesleyan community in taking into their immediate consideration the best means of *restraining that body from pursuing a career of intolerance and exclusiveness*, dangerous to the best interests of the Connexion ; and that, therefore, the following gentlemen be requested to *act as a Committee to correspond with all the Circuits in Great Britain*, and ascertain whether the opinion of the Societies is favourable to an aggregate Meeting of delegates for the purpose of deliberating upon the present crisis of affairs ; and that the said Committee be empowered to receive subscriptions.

In the paper of the same date, he says :—

From the manifesto of the three expelled Ministers in to-day's impression, it will be seen what they have pronounced for, and what they intend to do. The Societies must support them. We go further in our demands than they do. *We ought to have laymen in the District-Meetings and Conference*. There is no reason against this. The age demands it. *Let all the Societies meet, form Local Committees, and correspond with the London Committee*. In all things act firmly, yet temperately, and success is sure.



This is a confederacy expressly condemned by the rules which I read; for while it professed to raise funds for the "expelled Ministers," it was also "formed for the purpose of systematic agitation," and is therefore *an unlawful confederacy*. The Circuits, too, are all to form Committees for local agitation.

September 10th, Mr. Harrison again stimulates the people to this aggression upon law and order, in a leading article, from which I give the following extract:—

It seems a settled point that there must be an aggregate Meeting of delegates from each Circuit, at least from each protesting Circuit. Without such a Meeting nothing can be done. Each such Circuit should at once fix upon its delegate or delegates, selecting for the purpose judicious, temperate, intelligent, and well-informed individuals. *They should be holders of office of some kind.* In the meantime they should make themselves thoroughly versant with the laws and usages of the Connexion from the earliest times, and with those principles of apostolic church government, which, *though not positively commanded*, are very clearly indicated in the New Testament. They will need this, as they have to do with skilful tacticians and determined opponents, entrenched in fortifications of half-a-century's persevering labour. The Conference party will denounce such contemplated Meeting as illegal, and threaten expulsion against every one who dares take part in its proceedings. There are precedents for such Meetings: the Conference recognised the right of the people thus to meet in 1795 and 1797, when the constitution of Methodism was settled by solemn covenant between the Preachers and the people's representatives. That constitution, thus settled, has been violated by one party to the covenant—the Preachers; and the people surely have a right to demand the restoration of the compact; and, now that the covenant is broken, to make new and better arrangements—*still more in harmony with the spirit of the age*. But probably there will be less hostility to it than we anticipate. If the people *will* a large reform, and give expression to their will, the concession will soon be made.

Again, in a leader, October 1st, he says:—

What says the Corresponding Committee? Are we, or are we not, to have an aggregate Meeting of delegates in London? What is the feeling of the Circuits? From how many have they received communications? *Let not the Committee shrink from publishing the exact truth.* If they have found a prevalent desire for an aggregate Meeting, and a general conviction of the necessity for extensive reforms, the sooner we have an authorized statement of the fact the better. *If, on the other hand, they have found a greater degree of apathy than they expected, we would earnestly counsel them by no means to conceal the real state of the case, or to defer its publication.* The ultimate success of Methodist reform depends not upon the amount of Connexional feeling at this moment in its favour: it depends upon the inherent justice of the cause, and upon the absolute duty of conforming every institution of a religious character to the free principles laid down by the Head of the church and his inspired Apostles, in the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.

Mr. Harrison was aware that the course which he was recommending would be "denounced as illegal;" but it

would be by the *Conference party*, and might be set at defiance.

October 29th, the Committee published a manifesto, declaring what changes they deem necessary, urging the Circuits to raise funds to defray the expenses of agitation, as well as to assist the expelled; and to hold Meetings in all the Circuits to elect delegates to the great Meeting.

The Committee, appointed at the great Meeting at Exeter-Hall, on Friday, August 31st, are of opinion, in common with that Meeting and with others in the country, that an aggregate Meeting of representatives, from all, or the majority, of Circuits, should be held in London, or in some large provincial town, at as early a date as possible. That Meeting to consider *the present fearful state of the Connexion, the causes that may have led to it, (!) the remedial measures needed, and the best means for securing an improved state of things.*

The London Committee recommend that you take the earliest opportunity of ascertaining the sense of the Societies in your Circuits, by *holding Meetings of the Local Preachers, Stewards, Leaders, Members, and Trustees*, at which full explanations should be given of the laws, usages, and recent occurrences in the Connexion; and that you then and there *appoint fit and proper persons as representatives to attend the proposed aggregate Meeting of delegates. Two should be appointed by each Circuit.* The general wish of the Circuits will determine the time and place for holding such aggregate Meeting. On these latter points the London Committee would be glad to have your opinion, in order to guide them in fixing both the time and place. \* \* \* \* \*

You will also direct your attention to the *Reforms which this Committee consider are needed* for the removal of abuses, and the stability, permanence, and extension of Wesleyan Methodism; such as,—

1st. *The rescinding of the anti-Wesleyan and unscriptural law (so called) of 1835.*

2d. The appointment of laymen as Treasurers of all the Connexional Funds.

3d. The discontinuance of the Nomination Committee, which makes Committee-men little better than the tools of their nominees; and the choosing of all Committees by ballot.

4th. The right of the Societies *in all official Meetings*, such as Leaders' and Quarterly Meetings, to memorialize Conference *on any subject bearing in their opinion on the interests of the Connexion.*

5th. *The admission of lay-delegates into the District-Meetings and the Conference.*

6th. The sitting with open doors of those assemblies, and the right of the Methodist people and the press to be present; and,

7th. The necessity of a rigid investigation of the Connexional Funds, by some competent persons.

The Committee deem it incumbent on the friends of liberty and reform, that suitable provision be made for the three Ministers who have been expelled by the Conference. It would be a just and fitting tribute to their personal worth, willing sacrifice, and the noble stand they have made in defence of liberty, and against the establishment of an inquisition. (!) For effecting that desirable object, *and for carrying out, also, those necessary reforms suggested above, a considerable sum will be required.* The Committee rejoice at the liberal spirit which has already been displayed, and indulge the hope that the friends will see that ample funds are provided.

*The Committee press this upon you. Act at once. Give according to your*

*means, and obtain as much as you can from others.* The local Committees should immediately appoint Treasurers, issue Collecting Cards and Books to those willing to collect or receive subscriptions. *Individuals may thus greatly help the cause, who, from their limited means, can contribute but little themselves.* The Committee depend upon your efforts. Collecting Books and Cards will be sent on application to the Secretaries.

Lay-delegation, the Meeting will perceive, is one of the subjects on which the Corresponding Committee propose to stir up strife. But why destroy the peace of our Connexion by agitating this question? Why should not those who desire it proceed to join one of the bodies who have adopted this change, as well as some others which are now proposed? The success of the experiment, where it has been made, is not such as to tempt us to betray our trust, change our institutions which we have received from God through Mr. Wesley, and fashion them after their manner.

November 19th, is the following advice:—*The people are recommended to break all law,—religious, social, and civil,—to assemble in their chapels, open their windows, while the expelled preach to them from the outside.*

G. W. (Bristol.)—Your suggestion is good; and whenever the Trustees, or a majority of them, favour the expelled, it may be done. We give it, therefore, to the public as you send it:—"How may the expelled preach to a congregation in a Wesleyan chapel on the Conference plan, the Trustees assenting, and the Superintendent Preacher dissenting, to the occupancy of the pulpit by either of the trio? Let the congregation assemble in the chapel; let a convenient window be taken out completely, or the upper sash be let down; then let a pulpit, sufficiently elevated, be raised on the outside of the chapel, contiguous to the window, and sheltered from the weather, and the thing is done. The Superintendent can put his veto on a Preacher's entering the pulpit, but he has no authority to prevent the people from entering the chapel. The scheme should be acted upon at hours when there is no service appointed on the Plan of the said chapel. A few cases of this kind acted upon, *will make domineering Superintendents somewhat chary of showing their power*, and will be public demonstrations of the sympathy of the Wesleyan body towards the expelled."

What notion can Mr. Harrison have of that worship which is due to Almighty God, and which He will accept? Can he think that the religious services of a people assembling in such a state of mind as this violation of Christian order must imply,—in a spirit of strife and contention, of animosity and hatred,—would be acceptable to Him,—the Author of peace and order, of unity and love, and not of disorder and confusion?

December 10th, Mr. Harrison tenders his advice to the Quarterly-Meetings. He recommends them all to reject every person nominated for a Circuit-Steward by the

Superintendent, unless he is sure to take part in the present agitation. The Meetings must receive "no mere nominee of the Preachers and tools of the clique." I will read you a passage or two.

If possible, *Wesleyan reformers* must this year be chosen to the office of Circuit-Stewards. That portion of the Preachers who are for *keeping things as they are*, will have its hands weakened—and such Preachers as desire to see New-Testament changes introduced into Methodism, will have their hands strengthened—if men of enlightened views, and of firm resolves respecting Wesleyan reform, are put into this office. This is a sufficient reason for the members of the next Quarterly-Meeting being wide awake to their duty. \* \* \* \*

The Circuit-Stewards attend the District-Meeting in May. *Will our readers wish mere nominees of the Preachers and tools of the clique*, or real representatives of the people, to be in the May District-Meetings? \* \* \* \*

"What can we do? The Superintendent nominates whom he pleases." He does. But the Meeting is under no necessity of confirming his nomination. Here is the people's power. Every member of the Quarterly-Meeting has a veto upon the Superintendent's nomination. \* \* \* \*

Decision, fearlessness, integrity, union, at the ensuing Christmas Quarterly-Meeting, may half win the day of Wesleyan reform. It may be disagreeable to vote against the appointment of men who have been long in office; *it may be a trial of friendship to lift up the hand against one whose only disqualification for the office, at this crisis, is, that he will maintain, as far as in him lies, things as they are*; it may be irksome to reject, one by one, every person whom the Superintendent shall on each rejection continue to nominate, until his list of men, in whom alone he can confide, be exhausted; it may be inconvenient should the Superintendent, this list being exhausted, decline to nominate another that would be acceptable to the majority, and the Circuit be for a time without a Circuit-Steward. But better far endure this inconvenience and pain, than that a *liberal reforming* majority, from a little squeamishness and much servility, from false delicacy and gross unfaithfulness, should succumb to a minority, when the assertion of their manhood suffices to make them free, and to give them a voice next May, next June, and next July; a voice which the Preachers in the District, in the Circuit, in the Conference, will assuredly understand, however little they may relish the rude cry of liberty from these representatives of the people.

December 17th, Mr. Harrison recurs to the subject, and again urges and charges all *liberal* members of Quarterly-Meetings to be present, and to act their part. The Leaders'-Meetings are instructed to act in the same manner.

Before another issue of our paper appears, many of the Quarterly-Meetings will have been held. We take, therefore, this occasion to *press most urgently* upon the attention of the members of those Meetings the matter of Circuit Stewards for the year ensuing, as adverted to by us in our last week's number.

It is in the power of every Quarterly-Meeting, if not to choose its own officer, to reject every nominee of the Superintendent, unless the individual nominated be a representative of the majority of the Meeting. *The Superintendent may nominate one who is known to be a Conference-man; but the Meeting is not obliged to sanction that nomination.* What can the Meeting

do? Do? Why, vote against *an unsuitable nomination*; and do so again and again, until the Superintendent has exhausted his list.

\* \* \* \* \*

The *liberal members of our Quarterly-Meetings* have now an opportunity, which they should seize, of giving expression to their sentiments. Such an opportunity may never recur for years. *Decidedly liberal Stewards*, in a majority of Circuits, would greatly influence next year's proceedings, both in the Districts and at Conference. Every man should therefore act as though the die were to be cast by himself; as though his own presence and his own vote, at the ensuing Quarterly-Meeting, were to be decisive of the acts and character of that Meeting.

We will not add more. We leave the matter to the judgment and fidelity of our friends. We know many Circuits in which the majority of officials is in favour of the present Wesleyan movement. Let such do their duty. Let such represent their Circuits *by voting against every man—however in other respects qualified for the office*, however long he has occupied, or *however much offence it may occasion*—nominated by the Superintendent, unless his nominee be the representative of the Circuit as well as the nominee of the Preacher.

The same remarks apply to *the first Leaders'-Meeting* that will be held in each Society, after the Christmas Quarter-day. \* \* \* \* *Wherever the Leaders are liberal, they can keep out of this important office every man who would be, as Steward, an official drag upon the wheel of Wesleyan Reform.* This occasion must not be lost. Wesleyan officials, do your duty.

In the same paper he gives the following among his answers to correspondents:—

CHRISTMAS BEEF AND PUDDING.—“I do hope we Wesleyans will be on the look-out for good joints and the best fare this season. Every man that can will well supply his table. Every Circuit that can should see well to the choice of its Steward. All members of the Quarterly-Meeting who are in favour of Conference reform *must lift up their hands against every nominee of the Superintendent, if unfavourable to the present movement in the body.* The advice you give on this matter in your last issue ought not to be lost upon the Quarterly-Meetings. Liberal Stewards in a majority of Circuits will accelerate the reform movement.”

Our Quarterly-Meetings in the several Circuits of Methodism are not to be trusted to manage their own affairs, and follow the dictates of their own intelligence and conscience; they are not to choose their Stewards, in the fear of God, and with a regard to the well working of their Circuit interests: in the spirit of a meddling factiousness, they are addressed as *party men, liberals*; and, no matter what may be a man's fitness for the office, if he be not a *liberal*, the Meetings must vote against him. Is not this evil in the church of Christ? Another evil is, that every Circuit, at its Quarterly-Meeting, must be made a scene of strife and contention; instead of peacefully considering how the work of God in the Circuit may be best promoted, the members must wrangle on the question of the

Stewardship. Then the spirit of strife must needs be carried out of those Meetings into the other Meetings *and homes* of the members. The entire advice is directly against the unity and peace of the church; it is given in the spirit of hostility to the Ministers in the several Circuits, and is calculated to excite enmity everywhere. It is advice to divide the house against itself. Brethren, must not this be offensive to the God of peace and love? What will He say of all this at the judgment-day?

This *dictation* every Circuit has not had the independence to reject; and worthy men, fit, by the confession of their opponents, in every sense, for the office, have been rejected, solely because they would be no parties to the agitation. What terms of censure would have been severe enough, had any men but *liberals* attempted thus to dictate to men holding office in our Societies?

December 17th, Mr. Harrison inserts a letter, which urges the Circuits to form Committees, have public lectures, &c., to promote agitation.

Before I conclude this letter, there is one suggestion more that I wish to offer, and I think it of more importance than any I have yet referred to. I think there ought to be a local agency established in all our larger Circuit towns, and arrangements made for *delivering lectures, holding public meetings, writing letters for the local press, publishing and circulating tracts having reference not merely to the matters of Connexional interest embraced in our agitation, but for the purpose of meeting local prejudices and partialities, replying to objections urged from the pulpit or by the press*, and which, from peculiar circumstances, could be most effectively dealt with by the brethren conversant with them; and not within the province of the present metropolitan Committee, or of any central Committee which may be appointed at the meeting of delegates.

\* \* \* \* \*

There are many Circuits in which there could be no difficulty in forming a most efficient staff of *pious*, (!) intelligent, and thorough-going reformers to engage in this work; men with clear heads and warm hearts, gifted with "mouth and wisdom," and able, by their utterances or their writings, to impress and edify others; men who can discern the "signs of the times."

I might name Bristol, Birmingham, Norwich, Sheffield, Manchester, Liverpool, Hull, York, Newcastle, &c.: each of these, and similar places, might thus be the centre of a radiation of powerful influences, sending forth its messengers of light and knowledge to all the towns and counties around.

Thus the cares of the soul are to be merged in zeal for change, brother is to be arrayed against brother, one party in a Circuit is to countermine another, and the law of Christ and his peaceful reign in the church are to be spurned through zeal for what is called Wesleyan Reform. Truly, brethren, the good ought to be immense indeed, which must be bought at the price of so much evil. But,



whatever others may do, the *pious* will not be parties to such an agitation.

If the Ministers regard it to be their duty to try to repress disorder in the church, by the exercise of discipline on the refractory, the people are to starve them.

December 31st, he thus advises the people of Lynn :—

A NORFOLK MAN.—We repeat our advice. Let the Lynn Wesleyans hold Circuit-Meetings in town and country, DEMANDING the restoration of Mr. Keed to his membership and offices. If the Superintendent and his colleague will not do this act of justice, let every Wesleyan in the Lynn Circuit do as one of our correspondents suggests,—*withhold all moneys for the support of the ministry in the Lynn Circuit. Tyranny must be crushed. If these Lynn Priests cannot be reasoned into common decency, they may find the people of opinion that they must be starved into it.*

To starve those Ministers into compliance who do not choose to do his bidding, and that of his party, but to obey the commands of their Divine Master, seems the favourite policy of Mr. Harrison.

On the 26th of December, Mr. Harrison visited the Third London Circuit, there to lend his assistance in exciting the spirit of agitation. In a speech which he then made, he suggested that *all the laws made by the Conference since 1797 were worth no more than the paper on which they were written.* A remarkable discovery! In the High Court of Chancery, however, the Lord Chancellor repeatedly held and declared, that the Conference “is the Legislative Body of the Society.” What it is, then, in *fact*, for it has acted and been recognised as such for sixty years, it is in *law*. This Meeting was notoriously an illegal Meeting. It designated, in one of its Resolutions, the law of 1835 as an *iniquitous law*; and said, that, *under a specious pretence*, it deprived the people of a privilege which they had before possessed.

Mr. Harrison attended a similar Meeting, the same week, in Islington, where one of our laws was voted as tyrannical; and another vote of the Meeting authorized the present Committee of Wesleyan reformers to choose proper persons to represent this Circuit at the Delegate-Meeting. It seems, then, there is a secret Committee in this Circuit; but they carry on their proceedings in the dark.

In his paper of January 7th, he allows a correspondent to recommend and urge that the *Missionary Anniversary in May shall be made a scene of tumult.* The subscribers to the Mission-Fund are, in Exeter-Hall, to interrupt the regular order for business, and set up a clamour for change :—

What are the true sentiments of a majority of the Wesleyan laity on one at least of the points in debate ; to wit, the Mission-House management ? Anniversary Meetings are, strictly speaking, Meetings for the dispatch of business, open to deliberation and discussion, to amendments, and such other alterations as may seem good to a majority of the members present ; to an extension or reduction of the number of officers and their salaries ; to an extension or otherwise, or substitution of new for old members, of the Committee ; and as all subscribers or collectors of a given amount respectively are members of the Society, each member so constituted is entitled to a vote. *If a majority of dissatisfied members, so entitled to vote, shall be in their places at the next Annual Meeting of the Methodist Missionary Society, they will be able to effect a thorough reformation of existing abuses, by simply moving, seconding, and carrying a series of amendments, nominating good men and true to office for the ensuing year. And if the reform movement be treated as iniquitously and unfairly as similar movements are being treated now in our current Quarterly and other Meetings, then let the aggrieved party demand a poll ; and let the Conference party negative the demand at their peril.* The question is a public question ; because it is not membership in the Methodist Society, but a money qualification, which constitutes the subscriber or collector a member of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society.

Thus the spirit of strife, if these persons, to whom Mr. Harrison gives his best encouragement, can have their way, is to have a public exhibition, and Methodism is to be scandalized on the largest scale and in the most open manner. Where is concern, in the mean time, for the perishing Heathen ?

January 14th, Mr. Harrison endeavours to excite rebellion in the Trustees against all the laws of order and peace which regulate our Societies ; and he urges them *to become disorderly and to agitate :—*

The Trustees are standing on the verge of an abyss, (where ?) from the depths of which they may avert their eyes, because of the pain which a view of it might occasion ; but they are there nevertheless ; and one fatal step more taken in a wrong direction by their Conference friends, may precipitate them down the yawning gulf. Let them consider before it is too late. As men who have a vast pecuniary interest at stake, let them meet together,—the Trustees of all the chapels in each Circuit. Let them acquaint themselves with their real position ; *let them freely and fully discuss the state of the Connexion*, and the points of disagreement between the Preachers and the people ; let them communicate, by deputations or letters, Circuit with Circuit ; let them come to an agreement on some general principles of sound reform ; and let those points be embodied in memorials, and presented to the next Conference. *In all these movements the Trustees must act independently of the Preachers*, as the Preachers have acted independently of them. Such an union would be the best means of bringing about a satisfactory arrangement between the people and the Preachers. Should such a course of procedure be objected to, as it no doubt would be, by the Preachers,—should the Trustees be threatened with expulsion, or be expelled for violating Methodist laws,—then they should unite for common safety and defence. Let a thousand Trustees subscribe five pounds each, *and there will be a noble fund with which to go to the High Court of Chancery*, and there



obtain that relief which they have in vain sought from the Conference. A good case can be made out by the Trustees, if only the Minutes of Conference for 1835 be looked to; a case which would warrant the interference of the Equity Court, and save the Trustees of the Connexion from ruin. It is high time the Trustees took up an affair of such vital importance to themselves,—vital, indeed, to those whose liabilities for chapel-property is ten, fifteen, or even twenty thousand pounds.

This is most unjust, both to Ministers and people. Did the Trustees build the chapels alone, or were they largely aided by the Societies and congregations, and by the Ministers? The persons thus advised are not Trustees *for themselves*, but for interests *sacred* as well as *secular*, in which the whole body of Ministers from whom the pulpits are supplied, and *the people*, have the deepest possible interest: everything connected with the proper management of the house of God is of interest to us all.\* To show how mischievous is the spirit now abroad and fostered by Mr. Harrison, I give you the following extract from his answers to correspondents, January 14th:—

J. C. (Somersetshire).—"A friend of mine has upwards of £2,100 on Wesleyan chapels, and is getting uneasy about the state of Connexional affairs, and seriously contemplates calling it in. What had he better do?" —We really cannot give advice. If the Conference would meet the people

\* It is remarkable to what lengths the spirit of faction will carry *honourable* men. A Norfolk Magistrate, whose function every one would suppose it is to observe law and order himself, and enforce their observance on others, has written a letter, publicly advising a collusion between Trustees of chapels and lenders of money, to contravene the purposes for which, confessedly, all the parties, at the time of forming them, understood the trusts to be declared. Some one, "a friend to the reformers," is to be obtained, who will become mortgagee of the chapel: he is then, without allowing reasonable time, ("at a week's notice,") to demand his money; and, if it is not forthcoming, he is to seize the chapel, and give it to the use of men not appointed by the Conference,—"*even to the expelled Ministers*, if he think proper;" "*and the Conference right to the pulpit*," he says, "*would be effectually defeated*." To defeat the Conference right to appoint Ministers to the pulpit of the chapel, and to secure which was a prime object of the Deed of Trust, is the professed object of the collusion thus openly recommended. This gentleman, who holds Her Majesty's Commission of the Peace, seems a very unpeaceful member of our Society. He reminds one of the Jewish Magistrate whom St. Paul so severely rebuked: "Sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" (Acts xxiii. 3.) The Trustees have most to fear from agitation. If a knot of agitators, connected with a chapel, succeed in throwing the Society and congregation into disorder and confusion, the peaceful worshippers, who are most likely to serve, in every way, the interests of the trust, by their quiet spirit and orderly attendance upon divine worship, will be disgusted and driven away, and will leave their seats vacant, to seek some more Christian house of prayer. Except from such cause of injury, the Trustees and note-holders have nothing to fear.

by concessions, or in a conciliatory way, the money would be safe; but if they push matters to extremities, *the sooner parties call in their money, the better for themselves.* The present aspect is ominous.

I have now adduced sufficient evidence to show you that Mr. Harrison is Secretary to an unlawful confederation, which is openly and secretly exciting our Societies to unlawful acts; that he has attended public Meetings, held contrary to our rules, and declared, in one of them, sentiments subversive of the laws of Methodism; that, in his newspaper, he has urged our Societies to strife and contention in their Quarterly and Leaders' Meetings; counselled the people to disregard order and law, and bear the expelled through their chapel-windows; to starve the Preachers into compliance with their demands, when in a state of revolt; advised subscribers to the Missions to disturb the Annual Meeting of the Society in Exeter-Hall, and the Trustees to confederate for agitating purposes, regardless of their Ministers. Now I ask you, brethren, Can our branch of Christ's church enjoy his legacy of peace while all this continues,—created and stimulated by one of our own members? Can our unity be long preserved, if this agitation continue? The agitators cannot hope to carry the *Connexion* with them. There will be a large number now, as in 1797 and 1835, who will remain true to Mr. Wesley's Methodism: more than a thousand Ministers have declared that they will hold in faithful keeping the sacred deposit, and will not change it. But then Mr. Harrison would starve "*the beasts*" into compliance with his demands and those of his Committee. Thousands of our people, however, they will not be able to starve into surrender, and the Ministers will not surrender though starved,—they will repel agitation in their vicinities,—it then becomes strife and contention; and these must rend asunder our *Connexion*, and lead to division, if it has not previously been torn in pieces. In the mean time, where is love one to another? Can men love as brethren who are engaged in these hostilities? But if love is destroyed, then religion is destroyed. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also." (1 John iv. 20, 21.) I therefore hold that Mr. Harrison's present conduct is sinful,—*it is against the Christian law.* He is not "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." He is not "following after the things

that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." He is not "walking in love, as Christ also loved us." He is not filling our church with the "fruit of the Spirit," which "is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;" but with "the works of the flesh," which are "variance, emulations, hatred, wrath, strife, envyings, and such like." As far as Christ's laws of peace and love, and the divine laws commanding abstinence from measures which provoke hatred and strife, are concerned, he is living in sin. Then he has, in these matters, entirely disregarded our connexional rules. Instead of *peaceably retiring* from our Connexion, if he decidedly disapprove of our system of discipline, and cannot conscientiously even *acquiesce* in it, he endeavours to retain and employ his position among us for the purposes of opposition and strife; belongs to a confederacy formed for the purpose of systematic agitation; and has identified himself as a leader and open partisan of disaffection and faction. My conviction, therefore, is, that this Meeting must, in truth, find the first charge to be proved, and must decide accordingly.

In proceeding to the second allegation, I must again appeal, in the first instance, to the Word of God.

I shall quote two passages, which show the Christian respect in which the members of the church are to hold the Ministers of Christ.

Heb. xiii. 17: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you."

This passage shows that they who destroy men's respect for Christ's Ministers, and indispose them to submit to the guidance of a faithful Christian Pastor, are enemies to men's souls. It is "unprofitable" for those who have been perverted, over whom the Christian Pastor has ineffectually watched: for he must give account respecting them at last with grief.

1 Thess. v. 12, 13: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. *And be at peace among yourselves.*"

The next passages which I apply to the present case, are condemnatory of evil speaking, and all the evils with which it is attended.

Eph. iv. 31, 32: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

James iv. 11: "Speak not evil one of another, brethren."

A heart right with God, and right with his cause, will not allow a man to take pleasure in evil, nor to speak and write respecting it with evident satisfaction.

1 Cor. xiii. 6: Charity "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth."

*Railing* and *reviling* are condemned in Scripture. I shall read two passages in which, by being classed with the foulest evils, they are shown to be a great offence to God.

1 Cor. v. 11—13: The Apostle had written to the Corinthians, and directed them not to company with fornicators. He now explains that he did not mean men of the world who might bear that character, or be characterized by some other heinous sin, "for then," said he, "ye must needs go out of the world." "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called *a brother* be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a *railer*, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Sinners *without the church* are left to the judgment of God,—the church has nothing to do with judging them; but it has cognizance of its own members, and must, in faithfulness, separate them from its communion.

1 Cor. vi. 9, 10: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor *revilers*, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God."

I will only quote one *rule of Methodism*, with application to the present case. It is in "the Rules of the Society." Members of all kinds, whether holding office in the church or not, are to evidence their desire of salvation,

First, by doing no harm, by avoiding evil of every kind, and "particularly speaking evil of Magistrates and Ministers."

These persons are often reviled for a similar reason.

The Magistrate is appointed to uphold civil order, and to see that the laws are kept; for that reason he is often denounced, especially in times of great public excitement, as an enemy to the *natural liberty* of mankind. The Minister is bound by his duty to God, to see that *order is kept in the church*, and that Christ's law is obeyed; and when he interferes, to check disorder and exercise discipline on the rebellious, he is often set forth as an enemy to the *religious liberty* of mankind.

In proceeding to adduce proof that these laws have been transgressed by Mr. Harrison, as the responsible Editor of the "Wesleyan Times," and in the manner stated in the second charge, it may be convenient to adopt the following order:—

1. Calumnious matter against the body of Wesleyan Ministers; and slander and abuse directed against individuals of that body.

2. Insinuations of evil, and evil reports, published against individuals whom the Editor opposes.

3. Instances of disregard of truth.

I commence with the calumny, slander, and abuse, directed against Wesleyan Ministers, and against individuals among them.

I have quoted two passages, in which the words *railer* and *revilers* occur. The Greek word, used by St. Paul, in both passages, is the same; and the interpretation of a railer or reviler is,—“One who useth reproachful language.” I will give you a short extract from the Vice-Chancellor's judgment in Dr. Warren's case, both because it will show how he understood the word, and the manner in which he condemned the evil which it expresses.

I am extremely unwilling to make any observation on a person whom, had he belonged to the Established Church, I should have been almost justified in considering in the light of a father; and whom, belonging to the persuasion that he does, I must still reverence and respect, on account of the very high character which he has always so deservedly borne; but, called on to exercise the functions of a Judge, I must speak without respect to persons, and I must say, that this document, this speech of Dr. Warren, appears to me to contain passages which, I do think, whenever a cooler moment arrives, and Dr. Warren shall be able to reflect calmly and seriously on what it contains, he will be seriously sorry that he has committed to paper. In the first place, we must consider the peculiar objects of the Methodist Society. The sole and principal object of the late John Wesley, as it appears from the Minutes of Conference, was “to spread scriptural holiness over the land,” and by means of a Society, voluntarily attached to himself, to set forth such an example of unblemished holiness and humility, as could only emanate from the purest principles of the Christian religion.

In proof of this I find, that, so early as 1744, the question was proposed in the Conference, "Do not Sabbath-breaking, dram-drinking, *evil speaking*, &c., prevail in several places? What method can we take to remove these evils?" In the same year, the Preachers are expressly called upon as follows:—"Speak evil of no one; else *your* word especially would eat as doth a canker." In the Minutes of Conference for 1792, is this direction:—"Q. 27. Expressions have been used by some, through a false zeal for their own peculiar sentiments, which were very unjustifiable. How shall we prevent this in future? A. No person is to call another heretic, bigot, or by any other disrespectful name, on any account, for a difference of sentiment." In the Minutes of 1796, it is said, "Be tender of the character of every brother. If accused by any one, remember, recrimination is no acquittance; therefore avoid it. Be quite easy if a majority decide against you." But, independently of any such suggestions or exhortations, every Preacher of the Wesleyan-Methodist Society, and indeed every person in the Connexion, must be fully aware, that, among the class of individuals who, as an Apostle has declared, shall be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, the *reviler* is expressly mentioned.

The specimens of reviling which the Vice-Chancellor quotes, are mild indeed when compared with some that I will give you from Mr. Harrison's paper.

That there may be no injustice done by a selection from one or two numbers of the "*Times*," composed perhaps in an evil hour, I have marked passages in successive papers, from the 1st of August last to the 14th of the present month (January). Mr. Harrison thought that I had *condoned* all his previous acts by giving him a ticket in the beginning of December, and that any accusation now made must refer to matters subsequent to that date. I do not concur in that opinion: you ought in fairness to know of Mr. Harrison's continuance in his present objectionable course. I have no objection, however, to read backward; to commence with the paper last issued before the day when I sent to Mr. Harrison the charges now under consideration. The passages marked are numerous; but the Meeting will say when sufficient has been adduced for their satisfaction.

I may remark, generally, that the Conference are familiarly called by opprobrious names; as, "*holy Inquisitors*," a "*knot of Inquisitors*;" the Stationing-Committee are actuated by "*selfish and sinister purposes*;" a portion of the Preachers are familiarly termed, "*the clique*," "*the dominant party*," "*the dominant faction*;" and, in one leading article, every reader is called to answer the question, "Whether that faction has not filled up the measure of its iniquity?" It is common to speak of the President of the Conference with a sneer, as "*the saintly*" President. The terms "*Priests*" and "*Priesthood*" are applied to the



Wesleyan Ministers reproachfully; much in the style of Thomas Paine, when he exclaimed, "O Priests, Priests! ye are willing to be compared to an ox for the sake of tithes!"

January 14th, the following is part of one of Mr. Harrison's leaders; it is headed, "THE DOINGS OF DESPOTISM:"—

We understand that a "general order" has been issued to Superintendents, to "get rid of the refractory," even if the doing so should decimate the Society. The *dominant party are rampant*, and apparently regardless of all consequences to themselves or others. They have the chapels, and the people the debts; and they care not what become of the people, should they question the Preachers' "right-divine to govern wrong."

Our columns to-day contain matters which reflect little credit on the Christian character and moderation of *the clique and its minions*, and which go to show that they are fully committed to a reckless procedure. It is clear, that, to maintain their ill-got power, they are *prepared to commit ecclesiastical slaughter* to an indefinite extent. The President, like one of the occupants of St. Peter's chair, has issued his warrants; and obsequious Superintendents are as ready to do his bidding, as were the familiars of the most Holy Inquisition in its palmiest days. They will readily assume the offices of prosecutor, judge, and executioner. Of their doings we may expect to hear shortly. There have been a few victims already, but by and by they will lie thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. There will scarcely be a Circuit where the Methodist gallows or guillotine will not have been erected, and where the religious sensibilities of the nation will not have been outraged by scenes as revolting and as pernicious to the general morals of the nation as the late disgusting exhibition at Horsemonger-Lane Gaol.

*The Preachers look upon Methodism as their preserve, and have, by their unrighteous "game-laws," made trespass a capital offence.* Methodism they consider *their* property, and the people but tenants-at-will; who, at the caprice of their intolerant landlords, may be ejected, without any consideration for future accommodation. Irish landlords are cruel; *but exterminating Priests much more so.* *The people may thank themselves for all this.* They have first made the Preachers by calling them out of the ranks; and have since fed, petted, and fawned upon them, till the poor fellows have lost all recollection of the hole of the pit from whence they were dug, and all remembrance of their benefactors, whom they now despise and treat contemptuously. Of all this the people still have the remedy in their own hands; and they must soon use it. *Wild beasts are best tamed by being underfed!*

This is very respectful writing of Christian Ministers! Brethren, your Ministers do not "look upon Methodism as their preserve," and make the people their prey; but I will tell you how they regard it. They look upon it as one large pasture, in which Christ has numerous flocks and many lambs; and when wolves get in, they will do their best to get them out. Brethren, *the people did not make us Ministers*; this is a favourite notion with Mr. Harrison and his correspondents; but God made us his Ministers,—



we were made Ministers by the call of the Head of the Church,—the people only gave us a “good report,” and so enabled us to pass into the public ministry. There is not a principle in Methodism which the people are more concerned in upholding, and, I believe, more resolved to uphold, than this. They would be indeed “poor fellows,”—poor Ministers,—whom the people made! And the people cannot *unmake* us. They can desert us, if they please, (which is not very likely,) and then we should go into the world of sinners, as our fathers did, and begin as they began.

January 7th, is the following among the answers to correspondents. It needs no comment. Infidelity has seldom expressed itself with greater rancour against the Christian ministry.

ANOTHER NEW SUBSCRIBER (Guernsey) says: “It may not be uninteresting briefly to state my motive for subscribing. *As priestcraft, in all ages, has been one of the most prolific sources of evil*, it becomes a duty to instruct the public mind, by exposing to light the true character of *the priesthood, as a class*; for we should always discriminate and yield honour to whom honour is due; especially since, in their ignorance, the people of all religious communities have been too much in the habit of regarding the ‘Ministers of religion’ as men almost incapable of doing wrong, as entitled to special reverence, and as oracles of truth. So I thought at one time; but observation and intercourse have corrected that estimate. The fact is, power, whether spiritual or political, if irresponsible, will inevitably be abused. Is it not ridiculous, that nearly half a million of the English population should contribute of their substance for *the maintenance of a self-constituted class*, whose duty it is to serve the church, giving them chapels, and schools, and colleges, and at the same time permit them so to domineer, that, should any individuals, with a view to their correction, complain of abuses, they are, forsooth, told to ‘leave, if they do not like the system!’ Such slavish submission on the one hand, and un-Christian lordship on the other, can exist only during the prevalence of ignorance as to the true rights of Christians. Hence, then, my subscription to a *journal whose mission it is to spread information on this important subject*,—a subject identified with the progress of humanity towards its predestined perfection.”

The last day of the old year, December 31st, came out the following effusion of extreme malignity; its heading is, “THE CONFERENCE IN A DIRTY MESS, AND NOTHING GOT BY IT:”—

*The odium and infamy which have fallen upon the Wesleyan Conference of 1849, for turning itself into an inquisition, are a great fact. Led by George Osborn, who himself is the tool of the clique, that venerable assembly has blindly followed its youthful and reckless leader, who, assured of the unanimity prevalent among his followers, and himself dazzled by the ignis fatuus of his priestly ambition, has conducted them, step by step, over the morass, until all at once they find themselves sunk to the chin in one of the foulest and most fœtid quagmires into which a hapless wayfarer ever found himself*

plunged by following a delusive will-o'-th'-wisp. What a queer spectacle does *this venerable assembly* present! Too dignified to cry out for help as yet; too deeply involved to extricate themselves from the slough; casting about wistful eyes in forlorn hope of a rescue; occasionally proffered relief by sympathizing parties, and even by sympathizing sufferers, but the attempt to relieve leaving them more hopeless of deliverance;—*the Protestant inquisition* stands, engulfed and sinking, an instructive and admonitory monument of the folly of priestly intolerance.

The "Fly-Sheets" were to be put down; the authors of them were to be detected. To accomplish this, the Wesleyan Ministers assembled in Manchester give the finishing stroke to a system of Austria-Russian tyranny. All law is trampled under foot; the ordinary forms of judicial proceedings are abandoned; the judges lay aside, *ab initio*, their proper character, and ascend the seat of judgment with the insignia and instruments of the executioner in their hands; the claims which even the basest felons have to a fair trial are indecently outraged and fearlessly resisted when pressed for by copresbyters and Christian Ministers; despotism distrusts its position, suspects the assailants of its power, marks its victims, tracks them by its bloodhounds, wreaks upon them all its accumulated vengeance. Everett, Dunn, and Griffith fall crushed beneath the weight of tyranny; *Nero smiles*; *Moloch nods satisfaction*; for despotism is safe—its assailants are crushed.

Tyranny never can slumber long; never can it slumber in peaceful repose. Its Dionysius needs a castle of a palace for its conscience, and requires for its safety an omniscience that knows where to strike the blow, and whence to drag out its hidden but existing foes. It can more easily wreak vengeance than it can strike the spirit that undermines its strength, and is resolved on its overthrow. It must decimate the ranks; it must lead crowds to the scaffold; blood must flow like Transatlantic rivers; the seat of despotism must stand alone, reared amid piles of desolation,—in the awful solitude of the wilderness,—before it can feel safe.

Thank God! 'tis so with our Wesleyan Despotism. The "Fly-Sheet" Writer is a Wesleyan Minister yet Unexpelled. A traitor, in the estimation of the domineering Clique, lives in the camp, attends the court, is a Member of the very Body that has transformed itself into an Inquisition.

"The Wesleyan Minister's Edition" of the "Fly-Sheets" rings the death-knell of the clique. Like the hero of antiquity, the cloak of vengeance in which it has wrapped itself is envenomed, and the poison even now enflames the blood, and carries inevitable death in its current. The Conference is not safe; its own body furnishes its death-wound. One—how many more, George Osborn?—one, at least, of its own members carries a quiver full of arrows; Indian-like, the wound is death, for they are steeped in poison. And he strikes unseen; none *knows*, many *guess*, and each guesses, we believe, wrong, who shoots the arrow. The archer is clad in invisible green. The clique, one by one, falls wounded: *a brother gives the wound*. Who is he? Suspicion prevails. Distrust prevails. Consternation prevails. Despotism raves, is bewildered, trembles, feels its loathsome power falling from a paralysed arm. *Who can trust a brother Minister now? Who knows but his colleague is the traitor?—that his co-committee-man is he who discharges the fatal reed?* Of what value are the resolutions, declarations, signatures of the Osborn test? *None can trust his fellow*. The secrets of the camp-council are known,—ay, to the very inn where an inferior in the commissariat department revels night after night with his superior officer. Mutual distrust among the brotherhood is a fruit of this new "Fly-Sheet." Dr. Bunting, thank thyself for this.

An unexpelled Wesleyan Minister is a "Fly-Sheet" writer.

Here is a great fact. *President Jackson, hast thou purged out the old leaven?* Then it has got in again. Is the Achan stoned to death? *Alas for thee, Thomas Jackson, Achan lives.* Achan lives in thy tents, O clique! Ah, St. George and the Dragon, what have your *priestly cunning* and legal pettifogging accomplished? Ye have made the Wesleyan Conference a proverb and a by-word. To save a petted few from dethronement, ye have abased the whole; to deify and canonize the elect, ye have forced an enlightened public to doubt the humanity of all. And what for? To ferret out, badger, and destroy the disturbers of ill-gotten and ill-used power. And, amid all this odium and infamy, what have ye accomplished?

Unexpelled Wesleyan Minister! accept our thanks for thy deed of virtue. Be easy. Let "fly." Thou art safe.

Here is a writer "rejoicing in" the "iniquity," that a Wesleyan Minister is yet found mean and wicked enough to shoot at his brethren in the dark; gloating over the loss of confidence in each other,—the mutual distrust which he expects to be produced among the Wesleyan Ministers by this new "Fly-Sheet" writer. Is this religion, or can it consist with religion? Is this fair and Christian journalism? or is it *such licence as no member of our Society and no Christian ought to indulge?*

In his paper of the same date he writes as follows:—

In our own community, we regret to say, events have transpired utterly disgraceful to any Christian people, and *worthy only the dark days of a besotted bigotry*,—events which are the natural progeny of irresponsible power and inflated pride; and which, in their turn, become the progenitors of tyranny, despotism, and Popery under a new name. Such exhibitions as have occurred this year have made Methodism a hissing, a byword, and a reproach. But we will not further regret it, because we believe an all-wise Providence has permitted the display to show the world the folly of trusting in man, and because we believe that eventually the cause of truth and liberty will be a large gainer. The dormant mind of Methodism has been aroused, and no opiates will now lull it to slumber.

Again in the same paper he says:—

We are painfully impressed with a conviction, which daily experience only tends more deeply to confirm, that since the day when first "*the one master-mind*" began to try his hand at ecclesiastical law-making, *the grand design of Methodistical legislation has been the increase of priestly power, at the expense of the rights and liberties of the people.* The tide has flowed constantly in that direction; it has never once ebbed; and if at any period interposing obstacles have diverted it from its onward course, the waters have not the less certainly eventually reached their level, though compelled, for a time, to run in channels somewhat devious and subterranean. *The aggrandizement of "the Order," and of himself through "the Order,"* appears to have been the ambition of the gentleman to whom we now allude, *through the entire period of his career.* It is not necessary to mention the name of the individual; the facts referred to are well known to every Wesleyan, and have, by this time, become "patent to the world." To increase, consolidate, and conserve the power of the priesthood, "by hook or by crook," (if we may employ an elegant and expressive Osbornism,)—*himself*, the while, the grand centre from whence all the rays of power

should radiate, and to which they should all converge,—appears to *have been his sole object*; and to a very wonderful extent his diplomatic labours have been crowned with success. *He and his minions* have had to deal with a kind, unsuspecting, simple-hearted Christian people; in whose character confidence in the Ministers themselves had raised from their own ranks was an essential element, and who, at one period of their history, would almost as soon have doubted the truth of religion itself, as the integrity of the teachers to whom they conceived it to be no small privilege to listen. And, O, it is pitiful to see how the finest instincts of a generous and guileless people have been employed to entangle them *in the meshes of ecclesiastical despotism*; cruelly, most cruelly, indeed, has “the kid been seethed in its mother’s milk.”

Perhaps no class of religionists have had a more entire, a more trustful dependence on the integrity of their Ministers than “the people called Methodists.” Perhaps by none has the attribute of infallibility been more nearly conceded to the priestly character than it has been by the followers of John Wesley. And yet, we hesitate not to assert, and we say it not wrathfully, but in sorrow, that *by no body of ecclesiastics, whether Pagan, Levitical, Mahomedan, Brahminical, Popish, or professedly Christian,—through all the ranks of the sacerdotal hierarchy,—by NONE has that trustful reliance, that unwavering confidence, been more heartlessly betrayed than by the leaders and governors of the Wesleyan priesthood.*

Here is an open imputation of evil, in the form of motives the most sinister and corrupt, against an individual Minister of the body; and the Wesleyan people are told that their Ministers collectively have more selfishly and corruptly betrayed them, than the most corrupt priesthood the world ever saw. Will the Wesleyan Societies believe this of their Ministers? Have they acted in this manner? We may safely leave with them this reviling.

December 17th, he allows one of his correspondents to say:—

The Conference of 1849 asserted the full exercise of its despotic power—expelling men without a charge. This is a blot which will never be effaced. *Methodism goes through the world with the brand of Cain on its forehead.* Poor President Jackson and his purgatives! The man of Hull will tell him, “that the ruler who goes to the top of his power, is like him that shall go to the bottom of his treasure.” A very bankrupt in presidential credit! The least fault that a ruler commits produces infinite mischief, for it diffuses misery through a whole community, and sometimes for many generations. *No man can review the acts of the Conference of 1849, without coming to the conclusion that its spirit and its measures were vindictive.*

December 26th, with the poorer members of the Society he declares that Conference men have no sympathy. The object of this representation is manifest.

*These Conference men have no sympathy with the poor*—they are surrounded on every hand by luxury and plenty; *therefore the wants of the needy never enter their mind.* The gentlemen of the Conference put their trust in the opulent and wealthy members of the Society; they trust to mag-

nificent collections; they have no regard to "the truth as it is in Jesus," else their acts and proceedings would not be so un-English and un-Methodistic.

Here several of the Leaders expressed their conviction that further extracts on this subject were needless, and the Meeting generally concurred in that feeling.

Mr. Scott said, I have extracts marked through the months of November, October, September, &c., up to August 1st. I will not detain you longer than just to mention the subjects of two of those extracts. September 17th, it is said in the paper, that "John W. Thomas is appointed on a Missionary Deputation to Ireland, *because he is known to be an anonymous slanderer.*" August 27th, the Ministers of the body are represented as saying to the people, "The wheels of our Connexion must be kept going; and this cannot be done without money. We will pray and preach, and you must give." An instance of profaneness in the use of holy Scripture which must revolt every Christian mind, the Meeting ought to have read: it is from a letter written to calumniate Dr. Bunting and Dr. Hannah:—

What, then, shall be said to these dealings of impartiality? If the Doctor (Bunting) be for us, who shall be against us? He that spared not his own consistency, but used the law of 1835 to destroy three innocent Ministers, and entombed it to protect one guilty under the strongest circumstantial evidence, how shall he not freely give us all things by conceding *lay-delegation to Conference!*

Surely if one of his correspondents was so ungodly as thus to parody a passage which speaks of his Redeemer's sacrificial death, Mr. Harrison's regard to that Redeemer and his Saviour should have prevented him from inserting the letter in his paper, and led him to administer to the writer the severest rebuke.

A most indecent passage occurs in the paper for January 14th: its object is to render the President of the Conference, as a writer, contemptible. A vile wretch, placing himself in a position of the most gross and disgusting indecency, is the image of the pure-minded writer; this image he then applies to the President, only it is his *mind* which is thus pictured.

I will now give you a few specimens of insinuations of evil and evil reports against individuals whom the Editor dislikes, beginning, as before, with the paper last published, and proceeding backwards.

January 14th, comparing Mr. Gandy and the Rev. Peter Duncan, he says,—“Morally, no breath has whispered aught against his (Mr. Gandy’s) fair fame. We are not sure that such is the enviable position of his prosecutor.” From this insinuation, readers are left to suspect that *something* has, *some time*, been wrong in the spotless life and character of Peter Duncan.

The reason why Mr. Smith, of Camborne, has written his able pamphlet in defence of the Conference, is not, according to Mr. Harrison’s paper, an honest conviction of the truth of that which he writes, and of his duty to write it; but “he is a writer;” “some of the brethren lend him their aid;” “he is a prosperous man, his house is open to ‘*the order*’; hence they speak well of him and puff his books; and one good turn deserves another.” December 31st.\*

December 24th, it is insinuated that there is some evil, affecting his character, for which the Rev. Samuel Jackson will be called to account; it is as follows:—

The “Watchman” then closes with the weekly rigmarole of Samuel Jackson about “eclipses,”—rather a portentous subject, *as he has a charge* hanging over him from one of his victims, *affecting his moral and ministerial character*; and if he wishes to emerge from his “eclipse,” there are some old women and sick folks who want prayers and pence, and who would be thankful for pastoral visits; or if his salary be not equal to it, let him return to his former “ordinary tradesmanship,” of spoke-shaving country wheel-barrows.

The Rev. William Arthur has a selfish motive for his advocacy and defence of Missions. It is thus set forth, November 12th:—

The Rev. W. Arthur’s advocacy of the present Secretaries’ management is suspicious, seeing that, in 1848, he was nominated by them for office in the Mission-House; and but for the opposition of the reformers, there would, at the present time, have been *five*, instead of *four*, Secretaries; and the intended additional one, Mr. Arthur, is doubtless looking forward to a providential arrangement in Bishopsgate-Street-Within.

You would suppose that the interests of the new chapel at Islington, the place of Mr. Harrison’s residence, would excite in him a lively concern,—that he would not write any thing that could be of detriment to the zealous and liberal endeavour which a Christian people had made, and at the opening services were disposed to make, to replace their

\* It is a curious question, Whence do men get their notions of the unworthy motives which they so familiarly impute to high-minded and honourable men? It is fair to ask them, “Are such the motives which ordinarily influence you, and which make you so familiarly to understand them?”



former house of prayer. But his animosity to certain Ministers, and determination to damage them, if possible, and promote the cause of disaffection and revolt at whatever cost, were stronger, it seems, than his love for the interests of religion which the chapel was built to serve. And, November 5th, a few days before it was opened, he thus writes :—

Something of the same sort (as the effort made at the Leeds Missionary Meeting) is just now in course of preparation at Islington. The new chapel will be opened on Thursday next, when some fire-works of this kind will be let off. It is, we confess, an "*artful dodge*." Certain Ministers have got themselves into trouble by their clumsy and ineffectual attempts to rebut the charges that have been made respecting matters of administration ; and, as a practical vindication of themselves and their cause, they are persuading the wealthy men who remain in their interest to signalize their special appearances in pulpit or on platform by "monster" collections. A great got-up collection is made at Leeds under the President's auspices ; *ergo*, he must be a "*saintly*" man and a clever pamphleteer, and anything spoken or written to the disadvantage of Centenary-Hall must be entirely unfounded. In like manner, the Islington Trustees are to *whitewash the Confidential character* of the Rev. John Scott, by guaranteeing that the collection which follows his opening discourse shall reach £150 ; while the evening collectors are to solace the President, smarting under the keen lash of "*Ethelred*," by making up an equal amount to his honour and glory ; the ladies and other classes of persons coming in for an equally good thing, in compliment to the subsequent *performers at the consecration of the new cathedral*. The happy thought of obtaining such substantial votes of confidence as these, is due, we believe, to the ingenious care of Mr. Rattenbury. Let there be no mistake, however. It proves, no question, that the dominant party are not without powerful friends and allies ; but it does not prove that the people in general are in love with their proceedings. The time has at length arrived, so earnestly deprecated by the Founder of Methodism, when he said, "Beware of making rich men necessary to you."

Can there be any question as to the *animus* of the above, any more than of numerous other passages quoted ? Thank God, the attempt to injure us was abortive.

The insinuation that no further account can be given of Mr. Jackson, the Missionary Society's Agent, than that he receives his salary, is repeatedly made.\* I will read one of the paragraphs :—

LAYMAN.—We in London can tell you no more about the Lay-Agent than you appear able to do in the country. We know no other report of him than what appears in the Annual Report ; and that is, that he receives his salary. What he does for it, we know not.

At a Meeting in Cowper-street, in October last, a young

\* If Mr. Harrison had wished to receive information, Mr. Jackson then lived in Islington, and would have readily told him. While engaged in his inobtrusive, but valuable, labours, it has pleased God to call him to his rest. Will his assailants feel no regret that the period of reconciliation with *him* is now finally gone ?

man, whom the "London Corresponding Committee" had made one of its Secretaries, stood forth, and threw out divers insinuations reflecting strongly on the character of Dr. Alder and Mr. Hoole. Mr. Harrison with avidity seized them, and reprinted them in a leader, with sundry of his own reflections. Dr. Alder and Mr. Hoole both indignantly denied the charges insinuated, and neither Mr. Harrison nor any one else has volunteered the slightest proof. The following short extract will show how willing Mr. Harrison is to encourage this display of hostility:—

METROPOLITANUS.—We have not room for a letter this week. Your observation we insert: "The silence of the 'Watchman' of Wednesday, on the letters of the Dublin Trustee, and on the questions proposed by Mr. Gibbons, is awfully ominous." It is "awfully ominous." A few weeks will possibly afford revelations accounting for this silence.

The Meeting here again expressed a feeling that no further quotations were needed; when Mr. Scott said,—I will only mention the insinuations directed against the Rev. Joseph Fowler. A few months ago, the "Wesleyan Times" most highly lauded him as singularly firm, dispassionate, and independent. Mr. Fowler saw it to be his duty to express his concurrence in the acts of the last Conference, and his judgment of the "*wicked* conduct of the expelled party since their expulsion." Forthwith Mr. Harrison turned round, and at once found a low and selfish motive for the change. Mr. Fowler aspired to be the leader of their party; they did not range themselves under his banner; and mortified ambition dictated the condemnation.\*

\* The feeling of the Leaders'-Meeting, that sufficient quotation had been given to show with what avidity evil, in one form or another, is imputed to persons, no matter how much above suspicion, prevented the following paragraphs from being read, though marked for the purpose. They are given here, to show that honesty and independence of character, however well-established, and however admitted and even praised by Mr. Harrison himself, at one time, avail nothing when the honest and independent man condemns the base and wicked agitation now industriously promoted; he is then no longer either honest or independent.

July 3d, Mr. Harrison writes as follows:—

"But there is a gentleman whose title to universal confidence is, we think, not to be impugned; a gentleman who, though he has not before filled the chair, has proved his pre-eminent fitness for high office by the admirable temper, tact, and judgment with which he has served in that of Secretary, and in every other official capacity; a gentleman singularly firm, dispassionate, independent, and self-relying; and who, to crown all, has the almost singular merit, the 'Watchman' himself being judge, of being as little mixed up with the 'Fly-Sheet' party, as he is with their antagonists them-

The complaint against Mr. Harrison which yet remains to be considered is, that, in his newspaper, he has not shown

selves. We need scarcely add, that we refer to the Rev. JOSEPH FOWLER. That he is the *only* member of the Conference from whom a perfectly impartial presidence could be expected, we do not presume to affirm; but we believe the expectation to be general, that he is *the* individual for whom those Ministers will vote who are supremely anxious that their deliberations at this epoch should be conducted with moderation, dignity, and fairness."

In September, Mr. Fowler wrote the following letter:—

"Leeds, Sept. 1st, 1849.

"I entirely agree with you in reference to the decisions of the recent Conference. If there had been any doubt in my mind, the wicked conduct (not to use a worse description) of the party since their expulsion, must have removed it. How many souls will they be the instruments of misleading, and perhaps ruining for ever! And really, if any unbiassed person will honestly look at the question, what will be his conclusion? What is the liberty claimed by the expelled? Clearly this,—'If I can print and propagate slander and falsehood against my brethren, without any legal evidence being obtainable of my having done so, I claim the right to do it. No matter how strong the suspicion, I will not *criminate* nor *clear* myself; and yet I demand all the privileges of a fellow-Minister. The vile document is without the name of a printer or publisher; (so it was at first;) but I decline to say whether I am any party to the publication, or have any knowledge of it!' Can any person defend this conduct? It seems to me not, UNTIL THEY HAVE LOST SIGHT OF REASON AND RELIGION!

"JOSEPH FOWLER."

"London, City-Road, Nov. 10th, 1849.

"Make what use of the contents of my note you think proper: the *conduct* of the men is *most condemnable*."

"JOSEPH FOWLER."

December 3d, Mr. Harrison again writes:—

"As to the 'wicked conduct of the party since their expulsion,' and the insinuation that they are likely to be instrumental in misleading and ruining many souls, and have, in short, 'lost sight of both reason and religion,' we regard these expressions, so unlike the ordinary character of Mr. Fowler, but so like the reckless denunciations of the dominant clique against all who do not implicitly bow to their sway, as the mode which the writer has chosen of signifying his desertion of his expelled brethren, and his formal adhesion to Mr. Osborn's Declaration and to the dominant party. The conduct of the expelled Ministers is as little wicked as Mr. Fowler's, and any one of them is as little likely to mislead or ruin souls as he is; while, for reason or religion, their friends have no need to fear comparison of them with their new accuser. Whoever may have written the 'Fly-Sheets,' they certainly are living and acting in the public eye, and need apprehend nothing from the malice of their direst enemy. The religious public will decide between them and Mr. Fowler's maledictions.

"The truth is, that Mr. Fowler had by many persons been supposed to be the leader of the party to which the expelled Ministers belonged. Those gentlemen, however, never ranged themselves under his banner; and mortified ambition may have had something to do with his open repudiation of them. Had they consented to act under his leadership, perhaps he would have thought differently of them. By their aid, however, he climbed into the office of Secretary, and he would not have objected to get still higher by the same means. But *now* it is a more excellent way of insuring the fur-

a Christian regard for truth. In our Local Preachers' Meeting, he professed to us that he would not knowingly write an untruth. I am bound to receive this assertion. Yet he is blamable in two respects. He has represented things in his paper, and allowed others to represent things, as true, which were not true,—respecting the truth of which he ought to have been quite sure, before he published them to the world. In making public what was calculated to damage a person's reputation in general esteem, or excite a prejudice against him, or to injure some important public interest of the body, or both, the least that *truth* required of him was, to *know* that the things set forth were true. It is not honourable, nor just, in such a case, to act on suspicion or rumour: a man ought to have knowledge and certainty. This has not been Mr. Harrison's course; and he is the more to blame, because, on some matters at least, knowledge was within his easy reach. Then, again, when contradiction has been given to a false statement, he has not always readily, frankly, and fully stated the truth:—either no acknowledgment has been made at all, or it has been made partially, so as to leave great part of the original impression on his readers' minds.

December 31st, Mr. Harrison inserts the following as a fact:—

JOHN WESLEY THOMAS.—A short time since there was a Meeting held in the Centenary Chapel, Dublin, or rather the room under it, for the purpose of making arrangements for the reception of the Missionary Deputation, &c. No difficulty was experienced in providing accommodation for any of the Deputation, until they came to the name of *this worthy*. More than once it was asked, "Who will entertain Brother Thomas?" No answer: not one of those who were present wished to be favoured with his company. An imploring look was given to one friend after another, but without effect. Mr. Thomas's literary acquirements were dilated upon, but still all was silent as the grave; nor was it until after no small degree of banter was made

ther step into the President's chair, to write such a letter as the reverend candidate appears to have written to Hull. 'Make what use of the contents of my note you think proper.' Exactly! And what better use than to secure his undisputed election to the Presidency? What less reward can the dominant party give for such a service?"

Then, on the 24th of December, Mr. Fowler is thought worthy of the following gibe:—

"THE SNARE OF THE FOWLER.—A knowing man said, in June last, to a friend of his, 'If Fowler is elected President, he will turn round.' It has been the opinion of not a few, and, we believe, of some of the Ministers of the body too, that the Conference would never effect a reform in Methodism; that must be done by the people. Does not every day's experience teach this?"

use of by one of the Circuit-Stewards, that his brother Steward allowed himself to be shamed into an unwilling assent to become the host of Mr. Thomas. This does not say much for the popularity of "Vates" in that city.

I am now able to read to you a point-blank contradiction to this statement, given by a gentleman of Dublin, who has invited Mr. Thomas to his house. The object of the article is plainly to prejudice Mr. Thomas in people's minds; and, probably, the cause which he has thought it right to defend.

135, *Stephen's-Green, Dublin, January 4th, 1850.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—My attention has been directed to an article in the "*Wesleyan Times*," of the 31st ultimo, (a paper I never read,) purporting to give an account of a circumstance connected with your name, which occurred at a Meeting of the Committee of the Missionary Society, at the Centenary-chapel, *Stephen's-Green*, for the purpose of making arrangements for the reception of the Deputation from England.

The writer takes upon him to state that, upon your name being mentioned, great difficulty arose in obtaining the consent of any one present, to open his house for your reception; and that it was not until my brother Circuit-Steward shamed your humble servant into a consent, that it was reluctantly given. I can only say, that a more unfounded or more untrue version of the facts of the case, could not be expressed.

I believe that half a score persons in the small Meeting would have cheerfully aspired to the honour and privilege, and that many scores of such friends to the cause could be found in the city; but the statement must only be classed with the numerous other false and calumnious statements of the same character published by the party, who seem to stop at nothing which they deem calculated to accomplish their unworthy objects.

I can only say, in conclusion, it will afford me sincere pleasure and gratification, if, in the good providence of God, we shall be permitted to meet each other, in April next, in furtherance of the great cause of Wesleyan Christian Missions; and I have no doubt this pleasure will be felt, in common, by all the friends in Dublin.

I am, dear brother,

Very sincerely and affectionately yours,

ARTHUR JONES.

*Rev. J. W. Thomas.*

I should have deemed it unnecessary to address these few lines, only lest, by probability, the article referred to, meeting your eye, may have occasioned some uneasiness. You may be perfectly satisfied that the statement is not only utterly untrue, but that the directly opposite feeling exists.

A. J.

December 24th, is the following statement—

A VOICE FROM BRISTOL affirms that it is too true, that a leader of many years' standing, is exhibiting conduct most scandalous to Christianity. She has said of Mr. Greenley, (whose only sin, we believe, is sympathy with the expelled,) that he "ought to be held over hell-fire, for some time, to torture him, and afterwards be let fall into it!!!" What is her Superintendent about? Mr. Briggs is expelled from office for an unfavourable opinion expressed respecting Quarterly-Meetings. Can this Leader, breathing a spirit the most

shocking that we ever heard of, wishing a fellow-creature in hell-fire, *be retained in office?* \* We shall inquire.

December 31st, is the following contradiction:—

MR. GREENLEY, Bristol, requests us to give insertion to his note. Our columns are too crowded. We insert all the material part. "It is due to the aged Leader, referred to in your 'Notice to Correspondents' last week, to state that she solemnly and earnestly denies ever having used the language, or conveyed the sentiments, attributed to her by a 'Voice from Bristol.' The rumour that such remarks had been made by Mrs. Brice, has been, for some weeks, general here; and I regret that, having repeatedly heard this rumour, *I did not inquire at once into its truth.* Mrs. Brice says, she hopes the Superintendent will make the most searching inquiry into this false and calumnious rumour; and I shall feel obliged, if you give, by the insertion of this note, publicity to her denial." This we do as in justice bound. We have so lately received Mr. Greenley's letter, that we have not had time to receive the reply of our correspondent.

Would not *inquiry* have been seemly and just, *before* this piece of scandal respecting a devoted Christian and most worthy woman was given to the world?

December 17th, Mr. Harrison writes:—

A MISSIONARY SUBSCRIBER.—You need not be surprised at the Resolutions of the Missionary Committee, approving its own acts, and confirming the validity of two similar commendatory Meetings held during the year. The case of a Committee condemning its own proceedings, would indeed be strange. Such suicidal folly will not happen in this case. In fact, the recent Resolutions of the Missionary Committee,—Resolutions which have only increased the ferment of the body,—were drawn up, it is well known, by Dr. Bunting, *who had them*, we understand, *ready prepared, cut and dry*, though they underwent some verbal alterations after he introduced them. What a farce of an investigation! It would be better not to do anything, than to do worse than nothing.

Had Mr. Harrison made proper inquiry, he would have learned that the prime part of this statement is *not true*. The Resolutions were not taken to the Meeting "ready prepared." Two members of the Meeting wrote each a Resolution, in the general sense of which the Meeting concurred; but the Meeting thought they might be amended, and these gentlemen, with another member of the Committee, were requested to write them again. While the conversation proceeded, Dr. Bunting wrote the Resolutions in the presence of the Meeting; when they were finished, the Meeting considered and adopted them.

October 8th, is a communication from which I give the following extract:—

\* \* \* If you find fault with Missionary affairs; if you complain of extravagant expenditure or exorbitant salaries; if you express dissatisfaction at

\* Mr. Harrison appears to think that discipline should be exercised *in some cases*.



£40,000 having been expended on a building in London, while the Heathen are perishing for lack of knowledge; you are met with the observations, "O, you are endeavouring to destroy our glorious Missionary cause; you want to starve our excellent Missionaries, who are toiling and wasting their strength in foreign lands; you are opposing yourself to the spread of the Gospel!" \* \* \* \*

It seems that some denial had been given, in the country, to this statement, that £40,000 was the cost of the Centenary-Hall; but Mr. Harrison *asseverates* that such was the amount of the cost.

R. ALDRICH, JUN. (DISS).—You may inform your Superintendent, that the huge building in Bishopsgate-street, called Centenary-Hall, *did* cost the Connexion the sum of £40,000. It now stands a monument of folly and extravagance.

If Mr. Harrison had asked me, I could have told him that his statement was quite untrue, and I would have told him what the building did actually cost. If he had asked Mr. Matthews, a member of the Committee residing near him, he could have informed him, as he did the Quarterly-Meeting, that the statement was a falsehood, and he probably would have given him the particulars of the expenditure, as he stated them to that Meeting. If he had referred to this book,—the "Report of the Centenary-Fund,"—he would have seen the sum which the building cost, and which was granted for payment, not from the Mission, but the Centenary, Fund. The account is as follows:—

	£.	s.	d.
Grant for the purchase of Site and Buildings in Bishopsgate-Street, for Centenary-Hall and Mission-House.....	15,000	0	0
Grant for the Erection and Completion of the New Buildings required for the Monumental and General Purposes of the Connexion, and for the Business of the Missionary Society	14,433	13	7

The "huge building" then cost at least £10,000 less than Mr. Harrison declares to the world. Why the exaggeration? The subscribers to the Centenary Fund willed that such a monument, which would answer purposes of great public usefulness, should be erected to commemorate the centenary of Methodism; they had a right so to determine; and his remarks serve less to show his love to the Missionary cause, than his animosity to the managers of the Mission Fund.

August 16th, one of Mr. Harrison's correspondents, speaking of the Meeting of the Committee of Review, held in Manchester, is allowed to write,—

Mr. Scott is put forward to defend the Executive, and to disabuse the Methodist people of the horrible blasphemy contained in the dreaded "Fly-Sheets." What does he let out? Why, that the Rev. Mr. Alder—I beg

pardon, the Rev. Dr. Alder—has £351 a year, only, of late, *with a princely house and furniture*; that the other *three* Secretaries have the same.”\*

Then, October 8th, he inserts the following:—

WESLEYAN CONSERVATIVE says,—“Nothing so stumbles me, and, in my opinion, is so damaging to our administration, as Mr. Scott’s speech in the Missionary Committee of Review. He there said, that the salary of each Missionary Secretary was but £150 per annum. This staggers me. I cannot conceive how, on such a sum, any man can live in the style which one of the Secretaries, at any rate, is well known to adopt.”

In the paper of July 30th, is the following very gross imputation on the Missionary Committee:—

If report be correct, there have been no less than £3,000 added to the Jamaica account, for which the Missionaries cannot account; and who, when they sought an explanation from the Missionary Secretaries, were treated with disrespect, and told to attend to their own business; and that, too, by men who are so very candid, so very ready, on their own showing, to afford every explanation required! I ask, is it not a fact, that there is a Missionary now in England, deputed by the Jamaica brethren, to prefer a charge and demand redress? *It is an easy matter for men to square accounts, who have them in their own keeping.*

In making this very serious allegation, did Mr. Harrison ask himself, if £3,000 were charged more than had been expended, who had pocketed the money? Had the Treasurers? Had the Secretaries? Had the Auditors, before whom the account of moneys paid and the vouchers are all every year presented? Had the Committee shared the booty among them? On whom had he, in his own mind, fixed the charge of defrauding the Mission Fund to this large amount, and receiving the advantage?

August 27th he returns to the subject as follows:—

We have heard that the Rev. J. Walton, lately one of the Jamaica Missionaries, was entrusted with the memorial from certain Wesleyan Missionaries, complaining that the statements in the Annual Report of the Society of the Jamaica District did not agree; nor could they make them agree with their own accounts to the tune, we have heard, of some thousands of pounds. It is reported that Dr. Bunting said in Conference, that the apparent discrepancy could be accounted for, and would be, in time. A Committee, it is said, is appointed to look into the case. Can the Rev. Mr. Inglis, or Rev. Mr. Blackwell, both of whom have recently returned from Jamaica, throw any light upon this mysterious affair? We are not confounding it with the memorial from Jamaica entrusted to the Rev. Mr. Lockyer, which latter we have a copy of.

\* In his paper of February 11th, Mr. Harrison is pleased to say, “Our Report says nothing of the kind. It said that they cost £351, including house.” Mr. Scott did not quote the *Report* of the Meeting, but the above passage. It seems Mr. Harrison knew very well what Mr. Scott did say at the Committee of Review. Why then did he allow one correspondent to say, that he said it was “£351, with a princely house and furniture;” and another to say, that he said, “The salary of each Missionary Secretary was but £150 per annum,”—and set neither of them right?

Letters were addressed to the Revs. J. Walton, R. Inglis, J. Blackwell, H. Bleby, and E. Lockyer, by Mr. Hoole, saying that the Missionary Committee were "about to meet, and would justly expect from them any information they might have it in their power to give." These returned Missionaries severally wrote, indignantly denying all cognizance of any discrepancy whatever in the accounts of the Jamaica District. Their letters appeared in the "Watchman" of September 12th. Did Mr. Harrison now retract the injurious imputation? Did he withdraw it? He did neither. Ought he not to have done so? September 17th, after giving passages from the replies of the Missionaries, he writes as follows:—

Having given these replies, we have to add that the substance of the paragraph came to us *from a party on whom we place the greatest reliance*, and we have since learned that he received it from Mr. Blackwell himself, who does not deny having spoken on the subject; and he remarks that he did so "from the verbal reports of others." This agrees with our private information. His communications were said to be based on what Mr. Walton had told him, and were made after his return from the Isle of Wight, where Mr. W. was officiating. It did not originate with us.

With whomsoever the calumny and falsehood originated, ought not Mr. Harrison, if he sought no end but truth, and sought his end only by means of truth, *now* to have frankly retracted what he had written, and expressed his regret that he had given to the world a false report? Would it not have been honourable to have told the Missionary Committee who was the party on whom he "placed the greatest reliance?" But, no; October 22d, he returns to it again as follows:—

A LEADER (Islington).—The Rev. Samuel Jackson may sneer, and certain medical practitioners may profess great abhorrence; but we are persuaded that so strongly worded a Memorial\* would never have been sent from Jamaica, had there been no serious cause of complaint on the part of the Missionaries. *Men whose life or death depends on their doing the bidding of the clique, may write disclaiming letters in vain.* We gave the account on the testimony of the Rev. John Blackwell. He has never denied that he made such a statement. If there was any incorrectness in the account, it originated with him, not us.

His enmity to "the clique" seems the ground-work of the whole affair, and that will not allow him to be honourable and truthful: he adheres to the rumour, and the false charge, when he had not a tittle of evidence or reason to adduce in their support.

November 19th, Mr. Harrison returns to the subject

\* There is not a word in the Memorial respecting any discrepancy in the accounts.

again. He refers to Mr. Blackwell, and says, "Let him be taunted with the misrepresentation, and not us.\* He is the source, we the channel only." Mr. Blackwell had distinctly said, in his letter published September 12th,—*"I never was in Jamaica, nor have I any correspondent there; and therefore I know nothing of the Committee's accounts with that District."*

Pertinacious, however, in untruth, in the paper for December 10th is a leading article, headed, NOT JAMAICA, BUT ANTIGUA. I give the following extracts:—

Our contemporary and his correspondents have done their utmost to make it appear that we have fabricated charges for the mere pleasure of bringing them, and that for those charges there is no foundation whatever in fact. We are now in a condition to relieve ourselves from the base imputation of inventing matter of accusation, and *to raise a strong presumption, at least*, that our contemporary and his friends are the parties *who have attempted to impose upon the public*. At all events, it will soon be seen that any mistakes which we may have committed are, considering all things, *very venial*, very immaterial, and are the pure result of misinformation.

It is said, in short, that THE WESLEYAN TIMES is slanderous and false, because of the statements it has put forth respecting a discrepancy between the accounts of the Jamaica District and the Mission-house. Now, warned by the discovery of our former mistake, we will make no rash assertions; *but we must respectfully ask the authorities of Centenary-hall, whether our main, if not our only, error did not consist in putting Jamaica for Antigua?* Might not a Missionary be named who stated to several brother Missionaries in the former island, that such a discrepancy between the accounts of the latter island, or District, and the Mission-house had existed? Was it not affirmed that that discrepancy involved a large sum of money; and that, when the District-Meeting pointed out the discrepancy, and asked for information, they were snubbed by the Secretary, and told to mind their own business? We do not choose, at present, to name the author of this version of the story, though, were we to do so, the little mistake of *putting Jamaica for Antigua, which enabled the authorities so boldly and instantly to contradict it*, would be seen to be very natural under the circumstances. But the individual is at hand, and will probably be ready whenever he may be called for.

December 17th is the following:—

INQUIRER (Chelmsford).—We have again and again explained how the report originated. The Rev. James Walton told it to the Rev. John Blackwell, and he again to another, and so on. There appears only one inaccuracy in the affair,—the substitution of Jamaica for Antigua. The former gentleman also mentioned the discrepancy to parties in Jamaica, from which island he has not long returned.

December 31st, Mr. Harrison still adheres to the falsehood, and writes as follows:—

An abortive attempt to get rid of the whole case by a vote of confidence,

\* Mr. Harrison deserves great blame and condemnation for persisting to maintain this untruth. Surely if "the clique" could be discredited only by means of falsehood, a Christian would have asked whether he had not better give up the attempt.

*emanating from themselves*, has indeed been made by the officials, and a mistake respecting the island of Jamaica, into which we were led by a correspondent, on whom we had, *and still have, the fullest reliance*, has been magnified into a reason why credence should be withheld from us. Seeing that the mistake referred to affected not the *fact*, but the *locality*, Jamaica being substituted for Antigua, and that we did not originate the report, we are more than surprised at the disingenuousness and want of candour exhibited by our opponents and those with whom the affair really originated,—the Rev. John Blackwell, of Horncastle, and the Rev. James Walton, of Chelmsford. If there be really no truth in the report, these latter are the parties to blame; and we now call upon them, as men of honour, to set themselves and us right with the Wesleyan public. We offer them the opportunity through our columns.

January 5th, Rev. J. Walton indignantly writes as follows:—

The “abuse” they have discovered was first in “Jamaica,” then, “not in Jamaica, but Antigua;” by and by it will be in New-Zealand, or perhaps at the North Pole! \* \* \* With regard to the reported “discrepancy,” I may say that, during twenty years’ service, I have never spoken myself, nor have I ever conversed with a Missionary, or any other person on the Mission Stations, who spoke of any such discrepancy, or who have referred to the District expenditure, in any such way as would convey the idea of mismanagement or want of confidence, or reflect dishonour upon our Secretaries. Nor do I think a Missionary can be found, either at present in the field, or returned to this country, who has not, with myself, the fullest confidence in the financial operations of the Committee.

Here I may very well conclude this exhibition of Mr. Harrison’s regard for honour and truth. In doing so it may be sufficient to say, that there is not a tittle of truth in what he wishes his readers to believe. No discrepancy in the accounts of either of the Districts mentioned, or of any other District, has ever occurred: no falsification or discrepancy *has ever been alleged*. The friends of Missions may be assured, that the officers and Committee have never robbed the Mission Fund.\*

I shall now terminate my quotations from this paper, and leave the Meeting to decide the questions now to be submitted. I have, I think, proved the several allegations in the second charge; but whether or not to your satisfaction, you must determine. The task has been to me an

\* The above statement respecting the “discrepancy” was given more briefly to the Leaders’-Meeting, and some of the passages now quoted were given only in substance. They are now inserted, as previously marked for quotation.

It will give great satisfaction and pleasure to all who *truly love* the Mission cause, and who have watched the efforts of its foes to injure, and the devoted zeal of its friends to serve it, during several of the late months, to know that the income of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, for the year ending December, 1849, is not less, but more by some thousands of pounds, than it was the preceding year.

unpleasant and painful one; but I engaged lately, in the renewal of our covenant, to do the Lord's work,—the unpleasant as well as the agreeable. The case is now in your hands.

A full and free conversation followed, in which strong condemnation of what had been adduced, and especially of its irreligious spirit and tendency, was universally expressed. One or two of the Leaders thought Mr. Harrison could not be guilty of writing such sentiments, and in such a manner, because no Christian could; and he must only hold a subordinate and irresponsible part in the editorship. It was also thought by those members, that some more formal proof of editorship should be given. This was done, by showing that he had repeatedly published himself to the world as the Editor, he was therefore, as such, responsible for what was published in the paper. The charges were then separately submitted to the Meeting, and declared to be proved by the vote of all present, (nearly forty,) with the exception of three or four who did not vote at all. It was resolved that formal notice of this decision should be given to Mr. Harrison by the Society-Stewards.

Mr. Scott then said, that, according to the Rule, a week must elapse before any judgment was given in the case; and it was agreed that, at the regular Meeting of the Leaders twelve days subsequently, the case should be decided. By a unanimous vote Mr. Scott was requested to publish what he had addressed to the Meeting, in such manner as he might judge proper.

At the Leaders'-Meeting, February 5th, Mr. Radmall stated that he had communicated to Mr. Harrison the decision of the Meeting, January 24th, and that he had informed him of this Meeting, and requested him to attend. Mr. Harrison was not present.

After some conversation, Mr. Scott said that he had carefully considered the entire case, and had taken such counsel as he thought necessary, and he would now communicate to the Meeting his decision. This was given in the following address:—

Mr. Harrison complained that I appear in this instance both as accuser and judge. I appear as neither, in the sense attached to those terms in courts of law. I am a Minister of Christ, charged with the *oversight* of a portion of Christ's flock, over whom I am commanded to "watch," as one "that must give account." (Acts xx. 31; Heb. xiii. 17.) I am also one of a large body of Pastors, to whose care one very large flock, or, rather, numerous flocks, of



his people are committed, and who are, separately and collectively, all responsible to him, "the Chief Shepherd." As a Pastor, I am to feed and *tend* the flock. I am aware how the Lord Jesus has characterized those who disturb and scatter it, and how he has branded the faithless shepherd. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy."—"He that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." (John x. 10, 12, 13.) This is grave instruction, both to people and Pastors. When a person in the church becomes an agitator and a divider, he ceases to be a peaceful member of Christ's flock, and becomes mischievous; the flock then must be protected against him, and he must be "marked" and "avoided." In this scriptural position I stand,—watching over the flock,—caring, I can most truly say, for the flock,—and resolved to do my best to guard it when exposed to danger. This is the reason why I have brought the case before this Meeting.

There is disturbance in our Societies. A system of agitation has been organized to foment and spread disturbance: Mr. Harrison appeared to me as a principal agent in promoting disaffection and strife among our peaceful and united people. To enjoy my quiet and escape abuse, I might have remained silent, and left the agitation and Mr. Harrison to take their course; but I reflected, as I have been often led to reflect, that "if it should happen the church, or any member thereof, do take any hurt or hinderance by reason of my negligence, I know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue." Yet I made no haste to interfere by appeal to you. Perhaps, in strict faithfulness, I have been too tardy. Advantage has been taken of this forbearance to strengthen the cause of disaffection and revolt. Mr. Dunn could speak thus, at a Meeting at Chesterfield, in October last: "A Committee would sit for the next twelve months at Exeter-Hall, to see friends from the country, and to answer letters, composed of Local Preachers and other officers in the London Circuits. He thought they need not be afraid of expressing themselves on this question. The Chesterfield friends had done honour to themselves; and, if they were cautious and kept upon the line, the Superintendents would be cautious in laying hands upon them. Not one of the Committee at Exeter-Hall had been touched. The avowed Editor of the 'WESLEYAN

TIMES' is a Local Preacher, and lives within a few doors of Dr. Bunting; and although the 'WESLEYAN TIMES' is called a vile production, the Editor passed the Quarterly-Meeting." (Paper, October 1st.) In various other localities, I am told, Mr. Harrison's continuance in Society has been pleaded by agitators as at least a tacit sanction of his views and proceedings; whilst I know that numbers of our intelligent and faithful people, in various parts of the Connexion, have complained that one so prominent and active in sowing discord among us, and disturbing our peace, was permitted to remain a member of Society. He did not, however, pass the Local Preachers' Quarterly-Meeting without remark. I complained at the Meeting in September, and again in December, of the un-Methodistical and un-Christian part which I thought he was acting; and, in the first Meeting especially, expressed a hope that he would change his course. Now, whatever was my own conviction of the evil which Mr. Harrison was practising, and of my duty to the church and its Supreme Head, Methodism has provided that I should have no summary jurisdiction; I could not exercise discipline in this instance without first convincing this Meeting that there was law applicable to the case, and that he had transgressed it.\* My course, therefore, was to give him, in writing, the complaint which I had to make against him, and then place before this Meeting the evidence which had convinced me that, in becoming a destroyer of the peace of our branch of Christ's church, he had taken an evil position, and was acting a very culpable part. This was done, and he appeared in this Meeting; but in the exercise of his discretion he withdrew, and would not hear the evidence, nor offer any defence; in other respects the case proceeded just as though he had been present. After two long nights had been spent in consideration of the charges, and of the evidence adduced to prove them, the Meeting, with great unanimity, affirmed by its vote, that both were proved,—no hand was held up against that conclusion. Never perhaps was inquiry of the kind, nor indeed of any kind, conducted with greater freedom from passion,—in a more patient, calm, dignified, and Christian manner, and every one entertained towards Mr. Harrison personally a kindly feeling. Yet the Meeting voted that the charges were proved: they could not, without violation of truth, and dereliction of duty, have done otherwise.

\* This is one part of the protection which our Societies have against the improper exercise of discipline.

But the evils charged, and now proved, are most serious evils. Mr. Harrison has, as we believe, not only trampled on our Connexional laws, but also on important laws of God, as given in holy Scripture. He has not abstained from "questionous" leading to strife and contention, and *endeavoured* to "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;" but, on the contrary, especially in the paper of which he is the Editor, he has sought to break all bond of peace, and to rouse a spirit of agitation and opposition to our laws and to all legitimate authority: instead of allowing us to "be of one mind," and live in "one spirit," he has laboured to produce a divided spirit. Refusing to follow "after the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another," he has advised and urged our people to courses of action which must "gender strifes," and produce the mischiefs which ensue when religious men engage in fierce contention; "debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults." (2 Tim. ii. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 20.) Is not this a course which every godly man must condemn? To destroy "the peace of Jerusalem," for which we are commanded to "pray;" to distract the attention of the young, the poor, the simple and honest-hearted from the cares of their souls, by "good words and fair speeches" about Christian liberty and Methodist reform; to fill them with evil-surmisings, and with feelings of aversion from their Ministers; surely these are great evils in the sight of God. As to the love with which Christ has commanded his disciples to love one another, Mr. Harrison has written to exasperate one person against another, if they differ in opinion,—one class against another,—and to excite *hatred* rather than love. There is one part of his conduct which I think Mr. Harrison will one day seriously regret,—the manner in which he has, for a long time, vilified the Ministers of Christ. The Scriptures say, that they ought to be treated with respectful regard. "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." (1 Thess. v. 12, 13.) And one of the rules of our Society is, that the members speak not evil of Ministers. But he has never, in his paper, a good word to give to Wesleyan Ministers, unless he regards them as of his party, or, by flattery, hopes to win them to his party. No terms are too reproachful with which to revile them; no gall too bitter in which to steep the words and expressions in which he speaks of them; no imputation of sinister and selfish motives is

too gross to be directed against them. Now we are not the vile men whom Mr. Harrison represents us to be. Neither collectively nor individually have we lorded it over God's heritage: in using our legitimate power in the church, we are not chargeable with partiality and injustice. We are not intent upon seeking our own; we have not regarded Methodism as our "preserve," nor preyed upon the flock: these are very malevolent imputations, but they are part of the violations of truth to be found in Mr. Harrison's paper: he mistakes his men, however, if he thinks that we may be starved into a betrayal of our trust. I cannot but think that Mr. Harrison will one day deeply regret this slander, especially when he comes to know, as in *one future day* he will, the amount of disaffection which he has produced in men's minds, not only to individual Ministers, or the present race of Ministers, but to the institution itself of the Christian ministry, by producing a hatred of all *Priests*, as he is pleased to call them, because, from the representations of his paper, they come to be regarded as selfish and tyrannical. These offences against Christ's law, and against his church, have not been committed rashly, and in some few instances: they have been committed deliberately: the evil is systematized, and kept up through a continuance of several months. Had Mr. Harrison any just ground of complaint against the Conference, that would not justify him in setting Christ's authority and law at defiance, and throwing his household, the church, into confusion, to obtain redress: to gain his object, he would still be bound to use mild and Christian argument and expostulation, and not clamour and abuse. Most sincerely do I wish that Mr. Harrison would gravely reflect upon these matters. I hoped that he would have been present, and that we should hear from him some expressions of sincere and deep regret for the position which he has taken, and the part he has acted, and some expression of readiness to atone for the evil which he has done. I had hoped to hear him say, that he would disengage himself from the party now intent upon revolutionizing Methodism, and discontinue entirely all endeavour to sow strife and division among us. He has not thus expressed himself. Indeed he told us that, until lately, he had not considered our Methodist economy, and that now he regards it as unscriptural. This view we cannot help; we have understood it long, and defended it, and seen it triumphantly defended against the objections which he seems to raise. We have received it, and we hold it in trust, from God:

it has worked well for the spiritual and eternal good of mankind, and we must maintain it. Taking all things into consideration, especially the greatness of the evil proved, and the extensive mischief which it has produced and is producing; weighing carefully the entire case with great anxiety and much prayer, my sense of responsibility to Christ and to his church obliges me to conclude that,—as Mr. Harrison, “instead of *peaceably retiring* from our Connexion, if he decidedly disapprove of our system of discipline, and cannot conscientiously even *acquiesce* in that system,” has “retained and employed his position among us for the purposes of opposition and strife;” has joined, and holds office in, a confederacy formed for the object of systematic agitation; and has, for a long time, calumniated and slandered the Ministers of our body, to the great scandal of religion itself; the whole of which conduct is “a flagrant transgression of that *morality of the New Testament*, the observance of which was a principal condition of his admission into our Society;”—he must be considered as having forfeited his claim to the privileges of our religious fellowship; and he is therefore no longer recognised as a member of our Society.

---

\*.\* In the quotations which I have made from Mr. Harrison's paper, I did not wish unnecessarily to tax the patience of those who may read this pamphlet; nor did I feel myself under any obligation to republish more than was necessary to expose the evil which I condemn. I have often given the passage entire; and when I have made an extract from an article, I am not conscious, in any instance, of having wrested the sense. I believe, in each case, where a part only is extracted, the entire context, if given, would supply no other meaning, though, in some instances, it might render the meaning less obvious and striking. Poison may be intermixed with things not poisonous; but, unless the mixture contain some antidote, it will not the less certainly kill, if taken in sufficient quantity, because ignorance and incaution do not detect it. The addition of the parts left out to the passages quoted, would leave their meaning the same; and, in many instances, to a right-principled mind, would show more strongly the mischievous character of the paper, in mixing up what is plausible with what is pernicious, and so “deceiving the hearts of the simple.”

